

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1871.

ART. I.—CURTIUS'S HISTORY OF GREECE.

The History of Greece. By Professor Dr. ERNST CURTIUS. Translated by ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, M.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Professor of History in Owens College, Manchester. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

WE have here the first volume of the American reprint of a historical work which has already attained an established reputation in Europe. The English edition, which also lies before us, consists so far of three volumes, and is to be completed in two more. The three published volumes go down to the close of the Peloponnesian War, (B. C. 404,) and it is to the consideration of these that we shall confine ourselves in the present article. The foreign edition is almost an *édition de luxe*, with its wide margin, clear, large type, and jet-black ink. The American edition, if it is inferior in these respects, can boast of being more compact and portable, of displaying an equally neat page, and of being furnished at, we believe, only about half the price of Bentley's. Large numbers of readers to whom the masterly histories of Froude, Mommsen, and Curtius would otherwise have been almost or totally inaccessible, will feel themselves under great obligations to the American publishers who have provided so convenient a series, uniform in size and in general appearance.

Professor Curtius, now for the first time introduced to our Western literary world, is one of two brothers who have become eminent in Greek scholarship. Georg, the younger, is the
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXIII.—34

author of a compendious and accurate Grammar of the Greek Language, (*Griechische Schulgrammatik*), which Professor James Hadley, of Yale College, has made the basis of his larger and elementary grammars, adopted in so many of our colleges and schools and taught with marked success. Ernst, the author of the history, is some five or six years his senior. Besides occupying chairs in Berlin and Göttingen Universities, he was a few years ago tutor of the youth who is the present Crown-Prince of Prussia. His mental constitution is, however, characterized by a boldness of conjecture and a freshness of imagination which this selection on the part of the conservative head of the German Empire would perhaps scarcely have led us to expect. His *Ionier vor der Ionischen Wanderung* is a work of great originality, and in his later productions the same traits are visible. A few years hence he visited Athens, in conjunction with other German *savants*, on an antiquarian mission, and made important excavations upon the ancient sites. If he was not so fortunate in these as was Strack, who was able to verify his suspicion that the great Theater of Bacchus might still be discovered under the present soil, and became instrumental in restoring to the world one of the most interesting relics of antiquity, Professor Curtius was, at least, successful in somewhat shaking the confidence which scholars had entertained in the genuineness of another of the celebrated localities of Minerva's ancient city. Having opened trenches within and without the large semicircular platform lying to the south-west of Mars' Hill, commonly believed to be the Pnyx, or place for the public assembly, he discovered steps at intervals leading directly up to the *Bema*, which led him to the conclusion that this cubical block of stone was not in reality the stand for the orators, but perhaps one of those "common altars" of the city (*κοινὰ βωμοί*) of which Xenophon speaks in the "Memorabilia." Since, however, the heavy retaining wall in Cyclopean masonry of the present platform, although posterior to the steps, is undoubtedly of a remote antiquity, and as Professor Curtius was unsuccessful in finding any traces of a Pnyx elsewhere, the majority of topographers will not agree with him in disturbing the nomenclature of this part of the ancient site. Nevertheless, Professor Curtius's *Sieben Karten zur Topographie von Athen* (Seven Maps on the Topography of Athens) is of the greatest

interest, not only for the accuracy of the maps themselves, (for example, that of the Areopagus,) but for the acuteness of the scholarly investigation.

It is interesting to note that, in his view of the materials we possess for constructing a positive history of the early ages of Greece, Professor Curtius differs widely from some of his recent predecessors, and particularly from that prince of writers on this subject, the late Mr. Grote. The latter, it will be remembered, regarding the traditions of the Hellenic peninsula in much the same light as Niebuhr sees those of the city of Rome, settles down upon the utter impossibility of discriminating between what is truth and what is simple invention, and contents himself with merely reproducing the stories of the ancients, rather as the faith of the nation than as possessing any intrinsic authority. He observes :

I describe the earlier times by themselves, as conceived by the faith and feelings of the first Greeks, and known only through their legends—without presuming to measure how much or how little of historical matter these legends may contain. If the reader blame me for not assisting him to determine this—if he ask me why I do not undraw the curtain and disclose the picture—I reply in the words of the painter Zeuxis when the same question was addressed to him on exhibiting his masterpiece of imitative art : “The curtain *is* the picture.” What we now read as poetry and legend was once accredited history, and the only genuine history which the first Greeks could conceive or relish of their past time : the curtain conceals nothing behind, and cannot, by any ingenuity, be withdrawn. I undertake only to show it as it stands, not to efface, still less to repaint it.*

Ernst Curtius is far from accepting this representation of the impossibility of further critical investigation, and therefore considers it to be the duty of the historian to do more than simply to repeat the ancient myths. For these, according to him, are not a curtain which obscures, but the drapery which reveals, even more than it conceals, the form it covers. We may not be able to remove it altogether, but we can through its folds desery with tolerable distinctness the contours of the object beneath. The founders of the Greek States are “figures like those of living men, but greater, grander, and nearer to the Immortals. They are no empty creations of the fancy, but in

* Preface to Grote's *History of Greece*, (Amer. edit., vol. i, p. 8.)

them the actual deeds of the early ages are personified and endowed with life. The stories of the Heroes contain a certain documentary truth; nor is there any thing arbitrary in them, except what the collectors of myths added for the sake of introducing a systematic and chronological connection."* Thus, if we could succeed in reaching the pure and unadulterated myths which date from the remote ages of Hellenic life, we should possess the means of recovering in great measure, if not entirely, the pages of the national history which at first sight seem hopelessly lost. Unfortunately, this is not possible. Original accounts, clothed in symbolic dress, are rendered all but unintelligible in many instances by subsequent additions. This confusion dates from the time when the Greeks with the progress of their culture began to cast their eyes about them, and became ambitious of linking themselves with those countries which for long ages had been the centers of power and intelligence. Egypt in particular awakened their enthusiasm, and the *real* connection between Phœnicia and Greece was thrown into the shade by a *fictitious* intercourse which it was now asserted had subsisted between the Egyptians and Greece. And it was not the Greeks alone who were ambitious to establish the reality of such an intercourse. It must not be forgotten that the Egyptians, now in their decadence, were at least equally anxious to claim credit for all that distinguished the Greeks from the rest of the northern nations. And so the clear source of history, found in the traditions of the Greeks, was troubled.

It was when by personal inspection they grew to be better acquainted with the kingdoms of the East, when they measured the age of the walls of their towns by the Pyramids, and came to know something about the chronology of the priests, that they were so strongly impressed by the overpowering aspect of the antiquity they found there, and of the written traditions ascending through thousands of years, explained to them by boastful priests, that now they would not hear of any thing Greek which could not be derived from these sources. The Phœnicians and the Greek mediators between East and West were forgotten; and now Cærops, the serpent-footed national king of Attica, as well as the priestesses of Dodona, were converted into settlers exiled from Egypt, from the barbarians of which land even the gods and their festivals were declared to be derived. Under the influence of these impressions and sentiments, which swayed the more edu-

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 70.

cated men of the nation from the seventh century B. C., the majority of the older historians, Herodotus among the rest, composed their notes.*

The credit of discovering Greece, as well as of introducing the arts into the peninsula, is ascribed by Professor Curtius, as by the majority of his predecessors, to the Phœnicians. Not that there were absolutely no inhabitants before their advent, but these aborigines were rude savages, occupying, in relation to the new-comers, about the same position as the American Indians sustained to the Europeans who visited these shores three or four centuries ago. The merchants of Sidon came to Greece in ships laden with rare and tempting wares, the products of that East which was so immeasurably in advance of Europe. Wherever they touched the inhabitants flocked to the shore, and there for a whole week their merchandise was exposed for sale and a primitive fair was held. It was well if it did not close with the sudden departure of the strangers, carrying off with them some of the lads or maidens, who paid dearly for the curiosity that had induced them to venture on board the Punic vessels to see the wonders they were said to contain. A life-long bondage in Asia was likely to be their recompense. Thus, Herodotus expressly tells us, Io was spirited away from Argos; and Eumæus, the famous swine-herd that figures so conspicuously in the *Odyssey*, in recounting the history of his life, gives a graphic narrative of the mode in which he was kidnapped from his father's affluent home by the same enterprising but not too scrupulous sailors, and sold into slavery in Ithaca.

Ἐνθα δὲ Φοίνικες ναυσίκλυτοι ἦλυνθον ἄνδρες
Τρῶκται, μὲρ' ἄγοντες ἄθῦρματα νηὶ μελαίνῃ†

The instrument of the abduction in this case was a Phœnician female slave who had herself been snatched away from her native Sidon by the Greek pirates, and who avenged herself and recovered her own freedom by stealing off upon a ship belonging to her countrymen, which had long been accumulating a cargo, and by taking with her her master's young son.

The chief incentive to commerce in Greek waters was the

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 73.

† Homer's *Odyssey*, 15, 414-5. Elsewhere (14, 288) the poet makes allusion to the tricky character of the Phœnicians. Φοῖνιξ . . . ἀνὴρ, ἀπατήλια εἰδός.

demand for that shell which furnished the most highly-prized of ancient dyes. Indeed, so closely did the color come to be associated in the minds of the natives with that sea-faring people who first visited them in quest of it, that down to the latest day it was known by the name of "the Phœnician"—*Φοινῖς*.

In the entire East the great ones of the earth were clad in garments of a purple hue; and for these the coloring matter was furnished by the purple-fish, which is only to be found in certain parts of the Mediterranean, and nowhere in great quantities. This remunerative branch of industry required considerable imports, their own seas being insufficient. All the coasts of the *Ægean* were examined by means of divers and pointer dogs; and probably nothing produced so immediate a contact between the old and new world of antiquity as the insignificant muscle in question, which is now left entirely unheeded; for the discovery was made that, next to the sea of Tyre, no coasts more largely abounded in purple than those of the *Morea*, the deep bays of *Laconia* and *Argolis*, and, after these, the *Bœotian* shores with the *Eubœan* channel. Since the vessels were small, and since it is only a small drop of fluid which each of these animals gives forth in death, it was impracticable to transport the shells themselves to the manufacturing towns at home. Accordingly the fisheries were so arranged as to make it possible to obtain the precious fluid on the spot where the shell was found. The searching expeditions remained longer away from home, and other vessels were sent to relieve the first. Changing landing-places and temporary coast-markets became fixed stations, for which purpose the sagacious mariners selected islands jutting out into the sea, and, in conjunction with the coast close at hand, offering a convenient station for their vessels. . . . The Phœnicians were aware of the importance of mercantile association. The discoveries made by individuals on a lucky voyage were used by mercantile societies in possession of means sufficient to organize settlements, and to secure to the business thus commenced a lasting importance.*

While accepting the fact as indisputable that the first impulse of civilization came from Phœnicia, and indeed that the very gods whom the Greeks worshiped were imported from abroad—to such a degree that in the whole Pantheon only Zeus, and those attributes of Zeus which by a very natural process came to be regarded in time as separate divinities, could boast a domestic origin—Professor Curtius rejects as untenable the notion of any colonization in Greece by either Phœnicians or Egyptians. Those who in after days were designated as such

* Curtius, vol. i, pp. 49, 50.

were, according to his view, as truly Hellenes as those among whom they settled. They were known as Phœnicians or Egyptians only from the fact that it was under the auspices of these nations that they formed their new homes. We may perhaps find an analogy in the colonies which issued many centuries later from Greece, and settled upon the coasts of the Black Sea and of Italy and Sicily. How was it possible for Miletus, Megara, or Chalcis to become the parent city of seventy-five or eighty flourishing States? Clearly the mass of the population could not have been drawn from any one of these cities. Had the entire body of the inhabitants of Chalcis emigrated, and the ancient site been deserted, they would have sufficed at most to constitute but two or three new States. But after the first successful enterprise under the auspices of the Eubœan capital, it was never difficult to secure a multitude that were ready to repeat the experiment of emigration with the guidance of the same shrewd leaders. The colonists came from far and near, and may have been of very different tastes, manners, and dialects; but the joint expedition sailed from Chalcis, its regulations and common character were derived from thence, and it was unhesitatingly recognized by all as belonging to that city. In point of fact, however, the nationality was no more the same in the case of all the colonists than is that of the immense number of emigrants that yearly come to our shores from the single city of Liverpool.

At an early age there were large bodies of Greeks under Phœnician and Egyptian influence in the East. In particular a considerable community of Greeks was settled in Lower Egypt. The Ionian sailors early followed their Phœnician rivals to that rich field of commerce at the mouth of the Nile. Following Lepsius, and combating the views of Bunsen, Dr. Curtius believes that they are designated as "*Uinim*" (Javan, Iones) upon monuments of the eighteenth dynasty, and that it may be affirmed from the records "that already in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries before our era great bodies of maritime Greeks were settled under Egyptian sovereignty in the land of the Nile."*

It is not strange that, referring so far back the origin of the intercourse of Greece with the two countries where the art of

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 55.

writing is known to have been cultivated in the remotest antiquity which we can trace out, Professor Curtius seems to have no sympathy with those Germans who, like the celebrated Wolf, believed that art to have been either unknown, or in comparatively little use among the Greeks of the period when Homer is supposed to have flourished. Indeed, our author indorses the old interpretation put upon one of the two passages in the *Iliad* which have been construed as alluding to the art of writing, and supposes the letter sent by Prætus to Jobates by Bellerophon (Book VI, 168, etc.) to have been not a pictorial representation but a genuine epistle. "The first communication by writing mentioned by Homer points from Argos to Lycia." * Whether the immortal productions of the reputed bard of Smyrna contain those marks of a single hand which may be deemed necessary to prove that they were neither clumsy compilations of Pisistratus and his coadjutors, nor overgrown poems of which a small "kernel" only is genuine, can be considered an open question by some, perhaps, even after the masterly discussions of Mure and others. But that writing was so recent an improvement as the literary skeptics of the beginning of this century would have us believe, is a notion whose absurdity is too transparent to be seriously maintained by any one who has kept pace with the brilliant antiquarian and linguistic discoveries of our times.

The legislation of Lycurgus and of Solon occupy an important place in the volumes before us, and their remarkable contrasts are well brought out. Adapted respectively with equal care to the wants of the two very different races for which they were intended, the Spartan and the Athenian codes are at the same time the exponents of the divergences that already manifested themselves, and the causes of the still greater contrasts of the future. With the Lacedæmonian, passive obedience to the authority of the State was an innate disposition. Lycurgus by his legislation confirmed the habit of subordination, and made of the individual simply a block fitted to occupy its appropriate place in the structure he strove to erect. Solon's aim, on the contrary, was not to bind, but to free the powers of men: "to educate the citizen so that he might develop in himself every human virtue, and pay the homage of free obedience

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 95.

to the justice from which the State derives its coherence." Both lawgivers were astonishingly successful in attaining the objects for which they labored; but how unequal the intrinsic value of those results!

In his view of the division of the best part of the Lacedæmonian territory among the Spartans, our author takes no notice of the objections which have been raised, and apparently with sufficient reason, against the view that the nine thousand portions of land were equal, and that this equality was permanently maintained by rendering the lots inalienable. The arrangement, if it ever existed, must soon have met with insuperable difficulties in its execution; and there is little authority in its favor. Indeed it is Plutarch, writing some eight hundred or one thousand years after Lysurgus, who first makes mention of it.*

The age of the tyrants was a critical epoch in Greek history. Hereditary monarchy had been overthrown, but its place was assumed by a rule in many respects more objectionable, as it was less national in its tendencies. It is true that several of the tyrants were men of culture. Some governed with moderation. Pisistratus was an eminent patron of art and literature. One or two others were generally reckoned among the "wise men" of Greece. But, nevertheless, their rule was, on the whole, characterized by severity and cruelty, and, what was in the end even more important, it led directly to the assimilation of Greece with the neighboring nations of the East, and to the complete destruction of that peculiar type of Greek development without which even the Europe of to-day would not be what it is. It may seem a slight thing that in Corinth the family of Periander aped the manners of the barbarians from whom his countrymen were accustomed only to obtain their slaves, or that a brother of his received the Lydian name of Gordius, or that he called his son after the Egyptian King Psammetichus. But when we find the same tyrant so unpatriotic as to sell Greek youths to serve as eunuchs at the court of Lydia, we realize what a disaster it would have been to the cause of civilization had the institution of tyranny become fixed permanently upon the young communities of Hellas.

-Professor Curtius well remarks:

* Compare Grote, vol. ii, p. 401, and Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. iii, p. 288, etc.

Had this tendency proved victorious, the Persians, when they claimed the supreme sovereignty of Greece, would have met with no national resistance, but with an effeminate and demoralized people headed by princes who, in order to obtain the recognition of their royal power, would have been equally ready to do formal homage to the great king as their supreme lord and protector. This we ought clearly to perceive if we wish to recognize the debt Greece owed to the Spartans.*

For, in truth, it was from this unexpected source that the deliverance came. Well may the struggle with the tyrants be styled the most glorious episode of Spartan history. For if the Spartans were not altogether disinterested, if they were moved by a desire to overthrow a system which, left unchecked, would soon annihilate that political structure of which Sparta was the corner-stone, it is certain that the result of their interference was to secure for Greece that independent development in the arts, in literature, in philosophy, and in government, which made it, in spite of its insignificant extent, the teacher of antiquity.

To the interesting description of Athens as it first began to grow into an elegant capital under Pisistratus and his sons, and to the lucid exposition of the modifications in the system of Solon's constitution made by Clisthenes after the expulsion of the tyrant Hippias, we have only space to allude. One feature of the reforms of Clisthenes is redeemed by Curtius from the contempt with which it has been generally regarded. We refer to the choice by lot of certain Athenian officers of State previously elective. The reasons which led to this change are well known. The legislation of Solon had mitigated, but had not altogether removed, the violence of party rivalry. The tenure of office was indeed short, and the incumbent had the certain prospect of a careful scrutiny of all his official acts; yet factions showed themselves equally active in wrangling for places of influence. Even the redistribution of the Demi, or cantons, into tribes, so as to break up all geographical parties and cliques, had not proved entirely successful. Clisthenes cut the Gordian knot by making the selection by lot. But was not the remedy as bad as the evil it was meant to cure? Probably it was, in later times; but not at first, and according to the evident intention of Clisthenes; for that intelligent statesman

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 311.

had certainly no idea of throwing open the highest offices of Athens to any and every one of the citizens, however unqualified he might be for the discharge of its duties. The lot only decided between the candidates who offered themselves, or were put forward by others. None but those who were well known to possess the requisite experience were inscribed. Public opinion was so strong that for an obscure or incompetent person to demand the right which was technically his would have been unsafe, or, at least, would have met with derision and insult. We have the strongest circumstantial evidence of this. Among the earlier archons we find the names of the most eminent public men of the day; a circumstance which would be contrary to all the laws of probability had the first executive officer of State, and his colleagues in the succession of royalty, been drawn at hap-hazard from the urns containing twenty or thirty other names. We shall be still more convinced of the truth of this theory if we take into consideration the special improbability that attaches to a strictly fortuitous selection of some of the officers. The third archon, or the Polemarch, as he was called, succeeding the king in his functions as commander-in-chief of the army, held an office, than which there was no other that more vitally concerned the preservation of the State. Is it conceivable that any framer of a constitution in his senses would allow this all-important post to be thrown open without restriction to the people, and to be held in the gravest crises of Athens by a man, against whose being suitable for the trust there would be an overwhelming preponderance of chances? Even when the Polemarch had relinquished his exclusive military powers, and where he was assisted by the ten generals elected respectively from each of the ten tribes, he yet continued to preside over them, and to give a casting vote when they were divided in opinion. At Marathon we are told by Herodotus not only that it was the Polemarch Callimachus who, at the earnest solicitation of Themistocles, by his single vote brought on the engagement, but that he actually commanded the right wing of the army in the decisive battle.* To intrust such a responsibility to a person not chosen for military merit, but elevated by a freak of fortune, would have been too dangerous a farce for the most extreme demagogue to enact.

* Book VI, chaps. 109, 111.

At the same time, it must be conceded that Clisthenes must have been singularly imprudent in not attempting to throw any safeguards around the new method of choice. Practically it was before long impossible to prevent the intrusion of improper persons into the body of candidates, and to forestall their election. The evil was not remedied as we might have expected it to be. There was no return to an election by ballot; but the equally effective plan was adopted in the case of the most responsible offices of stripping them of every thing but the shadow of their former importance. So the Polemarch, who had once been the generalissimo, dwindled away in importance until, when Herodotus composed his history—say forty or fifty years later—he was little more than a judge or guardian of aliens sojourning in or visiting Athens.

Any one who will attentively read the chapter on "The Hellenes beyond the Archipelago," with the maps of Kiepert's Hellas before him, will not fail to conceive a vivid impression of the importance of the western part of the Greek world, which, from its contrast with the limited extent of the peninsula proper, came naturally to be regarded in fact, as well as in name, entitled to rank as "*Magna Græcia*." The old country, as our author shows, was comparatively poor; the new settlements became rich. The sites of cities in the bounds of Greece proper were often inconvenient, the lands in the majority of cases not very productive. The new cities on the Pontus, or in the Italian peninsula and in Sicily, were chosen for their peculiar advantages when the entire coast lay before the colonists to select from. The inhabitants wasted no time in cultivating barren tracts of ground or in pursuing unremunerative trades. Each colony had its staples, and these were the best of their kind. Rarely could the mother country vie with the vigorous daughters she had borne.

The colonies had many of the characteristics which are strikingly displayed by those of our own day. One was a constant tendency to throw off new colonies, standing to the parent colony in the same relation as that parent colony did to the original "*metropolis*." This was a natural consequence of the fact that the emigrant's ties to his new home were comparatively of recent formation and weak, so that a very small induce-

ment sufficed to lead him to make a second removal of his home. Another noteworthy characteristic is found in the dialect spoken in the colonies. It has been proved by lexicographers that many of the peculiarities which our cousins across the water are pleased to denominate Americanisms are in reality nothing else than genuine English expressions, for which the best of authority can be found in writers of the seventeenth century, but which have become obsolete in Great Britain. So it was in ancient times, not only as regards forms of speech, but in matters of greater moment. Professor Curtius observes :

Nor is it possible to conceive a relation more salutary in either direction than the union between mother city and colony. The former appropriated all the fresh vital forces of the younger city, while the latter again compensated herself for her lack of local tradition and history by faithfully attaching herself to the mother city. In all matters of sacred law and religious statutes the colonies loyally adhered to the ancient traditions. Occasionally it was in them that antique customs were preserved with especial vigor ; so, for example, in Cyzicus the original form of the Ionian festive calendar and the names of the Ionian tribes.*

In the colonies, too, the history of the mother city seemed to repeat itself. Sometimes slowly, so that in passing from the latter to the former the traveler must have felt that he was also passing into an earlier age. But more frequently, as life was more active, so the various phases of society succeeded each other more promptly. "As a rule, the colonies speedily overtook the mother cities, and passed through a far more rapid development than the latter. Miletus had gone through the whole course of constitutional phases while Athens was still struggling on through a slow progress."†

In no other point was the contrast between the Egyptian and the Greek systems more prominent than the light in which the priestly office was regarded. Whereas in Egypt the priesthood was a caste, every member of which was invested with a peculiar sanctity, in Greece the sacerdotal class was not sharply defined or separated from the rest of the population. While in theory every worshiper was permitted to make his offerings to the deity, there were certain families with whom was supposed to dwell a special knowledge of the manner in which the

* Curtius, vol. i, p. 496.

† Ibid., vol. i, p. 498.

god must be approached in order to be propitious, and who consequently enjoyed the title and dignity of his priests. In some cases we have the express record that these families were the descendants of the person who originally introduced the worship of the deity into the State. Thus there arose by the side of the nobility of hereditary power a second kind of nobility, based upon sacerdotal privilege, which often proved itself superior to the former, and was generally much more permanent.

Nowhere did the priestly families so successfully assert their influence as at Delphi, where, in connection with the oracular shrine of Apollo, they formed a close alliance with the originally distinct class of the soothsayers. Indeed, that part of the Greek history which includes the centuries immediately preceding the Persian wars can scarcely be understood if the power of the Pythia, or those who dictated her answers, be ignored. Even in a material point of view this was important. In a matter at first sight so unimportant as the settlement of the gauge of the roads of the Greeks the priests of Delphi had a controlling voice. The roads themselves were at first merely constructed to facilitate intercourse with the temple. From Delphi they radiated in various directions. Professor Curtius says:

The art of road-making, and of building bridges which deprived the wild mountain streams of their dangers, took its first origin from the national sanctuaries, especially from those of Apollo. And as on the rocky soil of Greece a style of carriage-roads became usual consisting of ruts hollowed out in the rocks, on which the carriage-wheels could conveniently and easily roll along, it was necessary to establish the same gauge for all the temple roads in the whole of Greece, since otherwise the festive as well as the racing chariots would have been prevented from visiting the various sanctuaries. And since, as a matter of fact, as far as the influence of Delphi extended, the same gauge of five feet four inches demonstrably prevailed, not merely the extension, but also the equalization, of the net-work of Greek roads took its origin from Delphi.*

A more interesting exertion of priestly power was in settling the mode of writing. It is well known that while adopting the

* Curtius, vol. ii, (Eng. edition.) It is well known that ancient Greece was almost as destitute of good roads as is the same country at present. We have ourselves seen traces of old Greek roads such as Curtius describes, as, for instance, in the neighborhood of Aulis. Besides cutting a channel for the wheels, nothing more was done but to remove any great inequalities that might cause the horses to trip. This road led from Delphi to Chalcis.

Phœnician characters, with their shapes, order, force, and names but little modified, the Hellenes reversed their direction upon the page. This we have been accustomed to regard as purely accidental. The Egyptians, we know, cared little in what direction they wrote, whether from right to left or from left to right, or upward or downward; only they observed the rule that the animals, plants, etc., should face the point from which the reader must commence. In like manner it is notorious that in very early times in Greece the practice of alternately writing in opposite directions in successive lines prevailed, expressed by the adverb *βουστροφῆδόν*, because of its fancied resemblance to the customary course taken by oxen in plowing, the same precaution of reversing the letters being taken in this case. That the Greeks finally settled down upon the system which gave the law to Europe Professor Curtius does not regard as fortuitous, but as having its rise in a religious motive:

The Greek who observed the heavens in expectation of a divine sign turned his face toward the north; the right side accordingly was the fortunate side for him, because it was that of the morning and of light. Thither the hopeful glance of the seer turned; thither all movements had to be directed whence good results were anticipated. As, then, in prayer men turned to the right, so also the cup at the sacrificial banquet, the helmet containing the lots, the either (lyre) destined to praise the gods, were passed round to the right. . . . And since this whole conception of the Hellenes had originated from a religious point of view, it is also probable that the priests caused Hellenic writing, after some hesitation, decisively to adopt the direction from left to right, a direction which was probably first established when sacred *formulæ* were written down.*

The decline of the influence of Delphi dates from the time when Athens became the rival of Sparta, and the oracle, powerless in itself, came to depend upon the good favor of the two great States of Greece. As the material strength waned, an attempt was made to compensate for it by cunning and deceit.

Where Delphi could no longer command and rule it entered upon the course of a crafty policy, and the same priesthood with which the purest principles of morality had originated now endeavored, while inclining at one time to this and at another to that side, to maintain itself by intrigue and all kinds of dishonorable means †

* Curtius, vol. ii, p. 45.

† Ibid., vol. ii, p. 93.

We confess that the catalogue of the indebtedness of Greece to the "beneficent discipline of the Pythian Apollo," as Curtius is pleased with almost pagan enthusiasm to style it, seems somewhat extravagant:

But the development to which European Greece had at that period attained, and her national character, as definitely established in all departments of intellectual activity, in religion and ethical views of life, in political constitution, in architecture and sculpture, music and poetry, a character forming a decided and conscious contrast to the barbarians, of which we cannot discover even a trace in the Homeric world—all this was essentially a result of the influence of Delphi.*

Nor can we acquiesce in the view that the absence of a Delphi in the Greek colonies accounts, at least in part, for their rapid decline:

This offers an additional explanation of the fact that, notwithstanding the brilliant advance of Greek culture in the Eastern and Western colonies, and notwithstanding the arrogance with which the colonies looked upon the mother country, (*not unlike the colonies on the other side of the Atlantic and their views of "old Europe,"*) yet the central land came to be Hellas proper, the real theater of Hellenic history, and the most lasting home of Hellenic culture. The rupture with the ancient institutions, the contempt of old-world tradition, and a reckless movement ahead, might hasten the development of the cities, but could offer no pledge of enduring culture and liberty. The rapid advance was followed by a precipitate decay, even as a too luxuriant youth is generally succeeded by a premature old age.†

The familiar story of the Persian wars is told with a freshness and a vivacity that prevent the recital from becoming wearisome even to those who come to it expecting to hear nothing which they have not often heard before. In fact, the historian is able to throw new light upon more than one difficult question. For instance, every student who has attentively read the graphic account of the battle of Marathon by Herodotus has probably been struck by two singularities in the narrative. In the first place, we are told that one of the reasons that led the exiled tyrant Hippias, acting as guide to the Persian forces, to land them upon the plain of Marathon, was that this was the best place in Attica for cavalry evolutions;‡ and, indeed, not

* Curtius, *ubi supra*.

† Ibid., vol. ii, p. 94.

‡ Καὶ ἦν γὰρ ὁ Μαραθὼν ἐπιτηδεύτατον χωρίον τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐνιπνεύσαι . . . ἐξ τοῦτο σφι κατηγέετο Ἰππίας ὁ Πεισιστράτης.—Herodotus, Book VI, c. 102.

another presenting equal advantages could have been found, excepting the plain of Athens itself. And yet when we come to the description of the battle itself, there is not only no important part assigned to the cavalry, (from which the Persians expected so much, and of which the Greeks stood so much in dread,) but there is not even the slightest allusion to the employment of any cavalry at all. Again, how did it happen that the Persians, after so signal a repulse, were able to put to sea so expeditiously, and, circumnavigating the southern peninsula of Attica, to make a hostile demonstration against Athens itself, which might have been crowned with success had it not been for the marvelous expedition of the victorious Athenians marching in a single day* back from the battle-field to the capital of their little country? Professor Curtius suggests the following explanation :

It is incomprehensible how this operation (of embarking so speedily) could be commenced before the fighting was over, and how, after the termination of the battle, it could be carried out with such ease and success, unless we assume the ships of war, as well as the transports, to have been made ready for sailing before the beginning of the battle. These considerations incline me to think it probable that before the expiration of the nine days the Persians had relinquished the plan of forcing the coast-pass, occupied and intrenched by Miltiades, and that on the tenth day the fleet was already manned, and the cavalry in particular already on board. Miltiades accordingly ordered an attack when the Persian forces were divided, and their most dangerous arm removed from the field, and the troops which he charged were drawn up by the shore to cover the embarkation. This view will also explain why Miltiades carried out his attack at this precise point of time instead of an earlier or later, for why should he have waited for the tenth as the original day of *his* supreme command, after the rest of the generals *had* once resigned their rights in his favor? †

The idea of a pure democracy was one that was but slowly realized even in Athens. When the kingly power had for centuries been overthrown, when the constitution of Solon had been so far modified that the poorer citizens were equally admitted to offices of state with the rich, there yet remained a powerful check upon the will of the people in the celebrated court, or council, as it was called, of Areopagus. There was

* Curtius agrees with Grote in making them reach Athens on the evening of the day of the battle.

† Curtius, vol. ii, pp. 221, 222.

but one road to admission into the tribunal, and that lay through the archonship. All archons who had properly discharged their duties were entitled upon leaving office to take a seat, and retain it for life, in the court that met on Mars' Hill. Theoretically, therefore, the court should have been a fair exponent of the progressive, as well as of the conservative, elements in the Athenian commonwealth, for the archons, as we have seen, were taken by lot from the entire citizen population. That this was not the case was owing to several causes. Besides the circumstance that public opinion, at least at first, would scarcely tolerate an obscure or inexperienced person to offer himself as a candidate, the office, being laborious and unsalaried, deterred many of the poorer class from coming forward to seek it. Even if successful, the plebeian archon, as Professor Curtius clearly shows, was by no means sure of admission to Areopagus. A strict examination was to be undergone, in which there is little doubt that together with uprightness in the discharge of official duty, and purity of moral character, the political views of the aspirant were carefully scrutinized. A radical reformer stood little chance of acceptance when the quiet votes of the conservative majority could so easily dispose of his claims. Still another cause, which always tended to secure to the advocates of the old *regime* a preponderating influence, may be found, we think, in the wonderful effect which the very fact of being intrusted with an office at the same time highly responsible and held for life has in all ages exercised. The most reckless and inconsiderate lawyer becomes circumspect almost from the moment he takes his place upon the bench: the sentiments which the advocate was known to express being often a very poor guide for ascertaining those upon which the judge will act. Now the Areopagus, as the established tribunal for passing upon all matters which in the highest degree affected the moral and religious purity of the State, very naturally disdained to confine its functions to such flagrant cases of impiety as were brought before it for adjudication, and for a long time made itself felt as a political power in the State by interposing a veto upon the decisions of the council and public assembly.* And as this veto was uniformly given in

* "The Areopagus was not an upper chamber to which was constitutionally reserved a final confirmation of legislative acts; it rather followed the course of all

the interest of one party, and probably often when no clear proof could be given that it was from other than partisan motives, it naturally followed that the destruction of the privileges of the Areopagus came to be an achievement as much sought by some as deprecated by others. It was in 460 B. C., or just about a score of years after the Persian wars, that the blow was struck. By the law of Ephialtes the court was shorn of its political, but was allowed to retain unimpaired its religious, prerogatives. We can readily see the reason why the proposer of the law has by many ancient and modern writers been contemptuously denominated a vile and worthless demagogue, whereas "an attentive examination of the accounts of the ancients will enable us to pronounce him an upright statesman and citizen."* The learned Professor Wachsmuth agrees perfectly with our author in respect to the propriety and the necessity of the innovation. He observes:

This resolution did not proceed from any desire to detract from the dignity which characterized that noblest ornament of Athens as such, but from a conviction that as long as the archonship continued to be filled by the upper orders, the Areopagus, which was supplied from it, must, by means of its moral dignity, its reputation for justice, and the spotless purity of its proceedings, necessarily keep up aristocratic feeling, and generate a spirit in the mass of the citizens at variance with the projects of Pericles.†

Of that great statesman who had lent his name to the most flourishing period of the Attic commonwealth, we find an enthusiastic admirer in the author of this history. The age of Pericles occupies a good part of the second volume, and is set forth with all its affluence of material prosperity, of intellectual and literary culture, of painting, sculpture, and architecture, and every-where the impress of that singularly fertile and creative mind is distinguished. Not that the vices of the system which Pericles took part in originating are altogether kept out of view, but they are at least deprived of much of their

transactions in the council and the civic body, in whose assemblies it was probably represented by individual members of the college, in order to interfere in the case of all innovations which the latter considered dangerous. This interference amounted to a veto; for in the first instance no possible chance existed of passing a measure thus protested against."—Curtius, vol. ii, p. 379.

* W. Wachsmuth, "Historical Antiquities of the Greeks," (Oxford, 1837,) vol. ii, pp. 75, 76.

† "Historical Antiquities of the Greeks," vol. ii, p. 76.

depth of coloring by the care with which they are traced to their unavoidable causes. Thus the demoralizing practice of distributing the public revenues, or that portion of them which remained unexpended, among the people, with no reference to services rendered to the State, is shown to have been almost a necessity. In no other way could the influence of those wealthy citizens, who for selfish designs extended their hospitality to all comers, be effectually neutralized, than by the city itself undertaking to furnish its burghers with the funds necessary for gaining admission to the festive celebrations in the Dionysiac theater and elsewhere.*

While a popular history of Greece scarcely affords room for presenting at any great length the peculiar views of Curtius respecting the topography and antiquities of Athens, there is considerable interest and some novelty in his remarks on the famous structures on the Acropolis. This is particularly true of those that refer to the Parthenon. This building, according to his view, cannot properly be styled a temple, unless we concede that name to all edifices connected with the worship of the gods. It was in reality both a treasury and a hall for the great festival of the Panathenæa. The shrine for worship was the neighboring temple of Minerva Polias, in the Erechtheum, where she had from the first been worshiped under the form of a rude image of olive-wood. In this alone was the goddess supposed to dwell, and this representation alone was a legitimate object of adoration, and an authorized recipient of vows, prayers, sacrifices, or votive offerings.

The gods object to an alteration of the forms under which they are worshiped by the people, nor could Phidias think of substituting new statues for the ancient wooden figure of Athene. But images might be created which were to be neither objects of adoration, nor superstitiously venerated pledges of divine grace, like the ancient hideous figures of wood, but were yet religious images in so far as they represented the nature and being of the divinity, and inclined the minds of men to feelings of piety.

The magnificent gold and ivory statue of Minerva in the Parthenon was, accordingly, a great votive offering intended to enhance the glory of the shapeless olive-wood "that fell down from heaven." Only on occasion of the quadrennial Pan-

* Curtius, vol. ii, p. 444.

athenæa did the crowds fill its courts, and the judges of contests seated at its feet dispense the rewards of victory.

After the conclusion of the great festival the gates were again shut and sealed, and the Parthenon was once more simply the treasury; the shell of the statue of Athene was removed,* and the statue itself covered up; the figure of Victory was taken down, and the treasurers alone were busy in the temple paying out of the Opisthodomos the moneys for the current expenses, and receiving and putting away all contributions in money and dedicatory gifts.†

It was the architecturally humbler temple of Minerva Polias which, after all, formed the center of all the religious worship. It was thither that gifts were first brought, and especially the *peplus*, or garment that screened the rude image from the eyes of the vulgar.

The Peloponnesian war, although an unavoidable result of the greatness to which Athens attained by following out the sagacious policy of Pericles, was far from being desired or sought after by that shrewd statesman. A career of conquest could not lie in prospect for the city whose very urban territory was exposed to the forays of its neighbors, and whose navy was always stronger than its land forces. Yet war was inevitable with those States which had reaped little glory from the Persian conflict. Some had the stigma of having actually sided with the barbarian, and could hope to efface it, or to obliterate the recollection of it, only by a new war. Corinth could not forgive the city whose bravery and enterprise had placed it at the head of all Greece, and had built a fleet outnumbering that of the city of the isthmus. Sparta, less important in the councils of Greece than a century before, found her last hope of regaining an ascendancy she deemed an ancestral privilege and right, in a war that should humble her aspiring rival. It was the misfortune of Athens that both in the general enterprise itself, and in that great undertaking whose failure threw such a deep gloom upon all the latter part of the war—the Sicilian expedition—she early lost the only men to whose transcendent abilities the conduct of affairs might safely have been intrusted. Two years and a half of the war had scarcely passed before Pericles was

* There were not less than forty talents' weight of gold in the movable clothing of the statue, worth, according to Boeckh, some \$520,000.

† Curtius, vol. ii, p. 581; but see pp. 566–580.

carried away by the plague that had fallen upon Athens and added its horrors to those of the sword. Hardly, on the other hand, had Alcibiades reached Sicily and begun to put his magnificent plans into execution when his enemies succeeded in their plots, and dispatched the state-ship *Salaminia* to recall him to stand his trial before a prejudiced populace. In both cases power fell into incompetent hands. The loss of a commanding statesman well-nigh ruined Athens in the first stages of the war; but the happy issue of Cleon's boastful undertaking, and the capture of a number of Spartans of illustrious families on the island of Sphacteria, gave it a more fortunate turn. It was impossible for Sparta to carry on a hearty and protracted warfare with so many pledges of her good behavior, and so many earnest pleaders for peace, in the enemy's hands. And so it came to pass that after ten years of warfare the peace of Nicias restored the state of things to that which had existed before the war, as far as that was possible when so many men of the flower of the youth of Greece had been slain, and her most fertile and populous territories devastated.

Whatever may be said of the vices of Alcibiades, and they were great and flagrant—however firmly we may believe that he was born to be a curse to his native city—we are almost driven to the conclusion that, having once adopted his hazardous and unprincipled projects, Athens would have fared better in a material point of view if she had allowed him to execute them. As it was, there was no one who could take his place in the cabinet or on the field; no one could thwart him when, thirsting for revenge, he passed over to the enemy, and began to employ his powers of intrigue and organization in their interest. Morally, Athens was better off without Alcibiades at any cost. Absolute power was what Alcibiades aimed at, and nothing short of it would have satisfied him. Even a "tyranny" of the kind which Pisistratus had possessed would have been too limited. Athens must have fallen to the level of the eastern States, become a miniature copy of the Persian Empire, and shared in the rapid degeneracy that overtakes all such forms of despotic government. Military success at such a price would have been too dear; for liberty, and all that literary, philosophical, and artistic glory of which liberty was the prime condition, must have been sacrificed.

That Athens should ultimately succumb to its enemies after the fatal issue of the conflict against Syracuse was almost a foregone conclusion. It is only strange that for so many as eight or nine years the brave Athenians warded off the *coup de grace*. Here let us quote the appreciative reflections of Professor Curtius:

However deep the shame of the end of the Decelean War, yet there exists no more splendid testimony to the energy of Athens than the eight years' resistance offered by the city after the Sicilian calamity. Greece, Sicily, and Persia were allied against the doomed city, and yet she was not to be overcome by force; her fleet was victorious as soon as it had its right commander; her citizens were full of courage and love of liberty, steadfast, and ready to make any personal sacrifice on behalf of their country. But the whole war was a struggle of despair, because the Athenians had, so to speak, no ground left under their feet; they fought for the preservation of their State, but that preservation depended upon a number of foreign possessions, the permanent recovery of which surpassed their powers: the only remaining strength of Athens lay in her navy, and this was obliged to be self-supporting. The chief care of the generals had always been to procure supplies and pay; no connected plan of operations could, therefore, be pursued by them, and the war became a savage freebooters' war, which widened the gulf between Athens and her former allies till it became impassable. Money is the main question of the whole Decelean War, and, Sparta being equally without a treasury, the issue depends upon the money of the Great King. For this reason Alcibiades knew no better expedient for kindling the ardor of his troops before the battle of Cyzicus than by calling out to them, "The King's moneys are in the hands of the enemy. If you wish to have the one you must vanquish the other." Athens again and again recovered her naval superiority, but not the supremacy of the sea, which it was impossible for her to secure without a treasure of her own. Hence the aimless character of the fighting, and, notwithstanding the most brilliant victories, a condition of helpless insecurity, from the moment when the Sicilian calamity awakened Athens out of the intoxication of unlimited power.*

But it was not her external foes, after all, that humbled Athens, and brought her to the dire necessity of submitting to the Spartan arms, and to the tyranny of the "Thirty," whose institution Sparta chose to encourage. It was that treasonable

* Curtius, vol. iii, pp. 547, 548. The classical reader may remember how often Demosthenes in the succeeding century complained that by their neglect to furnish money the war against Philip was suffered to degenerate in a similar manner into *λῆστεία*.

party which had long existed at home—a party which coveted victory over the rival party still more than the prosperity of the common country. “Not even during the Persian wars was Attic history free from the blot of treasonable sentiments,” says Curtius.* “After the open rupture with Sparta a Lacedæmonian party formed itself, whose efforts were directed to the humiliation of the city.” And our author has correctly ascribed the fatal ascendancy which party spirit and party corruption now reached to the working of that miserable system of *sophistry* whose shallowness and mischievous consequences the philosopher Socrates, in Plato’s *Gorgias*, is made to lay bare to the gaze of the world.

It was the sophistical tendency which mainly contributed to arouse the decomposing forces. This tendency loosened the bonds which held the hearts of the citizens united into one national will; it taught the rising generation of the city to assert their personal wishes with audacious arrogance in the face of all tradition and usage, and to despise the virtues of their fathers. . . . It destroyed faith in the gods, reverence before the law, devotion to home and family, and abhorrence of wrong and of disloyalty. . . . The best intellects became the worst enemies of the commonwealth; education was converted into a prison, consuming the very marrow of the State; and the adversaries of the constitution, who desired to heal the sick State and establish a new aristocracy, a “government of the best,” founded upon wealth and culture, were baser, more self-seeking, and more utterly unconscientious than the most vehement among the demagogues.

The accusation is not an empty one. Theramenes, a leader in the oligarchical party, and a prime mover in the plots for instituting the rule of the “Four Hundred,” and afterward of the “Thirty,” himself declared the course of his colleagues to be in every respect more unjust than that of the sycophants under the democracy.†

The volumes before us close at an important crisis in Grecian history. The destruction of the walls of Athens by her enemies elicits even now the sympathy of all lovers of free institutions. The wanton insult of turning the hour of humiliation into a season of festive exultation we still resent; and the band of women who played the flute while the massive arms which Athens stretched to the sea, and which once secured her maritime supremacy, were being torn asunder, seem to be

* Curtius, *ubi supra*.

† Xenophon, *Hellenica* Book II, chap. iii, § 22, etc.

sounding in our ears a dirge over the fall of the grandest State of heathen antiquity. True, Athens was yet to rise again, and to produce some of the greatest men the world has ever seen, as philosophers, statesmen, patriots, and others; but her decadence had set in, and no mortal arm could stay it. Moral restraints were swept away, even such as were drawn from a false religion earnestly believed in. Meanwhile neither "peace" nor "good-will" prevailed. About three quarters of the population of Attica were in bondage. It was the labor of slaves that principally supported and enriched the citizens. Indeed, he esteemed himself but badly off who had not at least six or seven slaves to wait upon him. Could such a system of oppression in the very nature of things last forever? To suppose it would be to suppose a suspension, in favor of a brilliant but unjust state of society, of God's inflexible laws of moral government.

While heartily commending Professor Curtius's history to the careful perusal of the American reading public, we cannot avoid the expression of regret that the translation bears so many marks of haste and careless revision. Sometimes German expressions are simply Anglicized. Thus we have "bloodbath" for *Blutbad*, instead of "massacre," (vol. ii, p. 232,) and, "nothing less," where "any thing rather than" is intended, (p. 271, and other places.) Distances are stated in miles, which, upon reference to the atlas, turn out to be *German* miles, four or five times the length of the mile in use with us. The Athenians, we are told, when they started on their disastrous retreat from Syracuse, "on this day advanced the distance of a mile, (vol. iii, p. 380,) where Thucydides, (l. vii, c. 78) says *σταδίους ὡς τεσσαράκοντα*, which makes the march fully four and a half English miles. So in other places. On the whole, however, the translation is sufficiently intelligible and idiomatic; but the colloquial and inaccurate use of language is general, and almost universal. Not to mention others, what shall we say of such words and expressions as these: "The adherents of the oligarchical party befriended themselves with the idea of seeing Alcibiades return," (vol. iii, p. 425;) "he *was befallen* by the winter storms," (p. 466;) "*these* news had arrived," (p. 484?) Such blemishes as these can so easily be removed with a little care that it is a great pity that they should be allowed to remain and mar the external appearance of a really valuable work.

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES FROM THE CATACOMBS.

- Roma Subterranea.* By PADRE ARINGHI. Lutetiae Parisiorum: 2 vols. folio. 1659.
The Church in the Catacombs. By CHARLES MAITLAND, M.D. London. 1847.
The Catacombs of Rome. By CHARLES MAC FARLANE. London. 1852.
Fabiola; or, the Church of the Catacombs. By CARDINAL WISEMAN. London. 1857.
The Catacombs of Rome. By the Right Rev. WM. INGRAHAM KIP, D.D. New York. 1859.
Letters from Rome. By Rev. JOHN W. BURGON, M. A. London. 1862.
Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae Septimo Saeculo Antiquioris. By CAVALIERE DI ROSSI. Romae. 1857-1861.
Christian Epitaphs of the First Six Centuries. By Rev. JOHN M'CAUL, LL.D. Toronto and London. 1869.
Les Catacombes de Rome. Par M. PERRET. Paris. 1852-1857.
Roma Sotterranea. By CAVALIERE DI ROSSI. Romae. 1864.
Roma Sotterranea. By Rev. J. SPENCER NORTHCOLE, D.D., and Rev. R. W. BROWNLOW, M.A. London. 1869.
The Testimony of the Catacombs. By Rev. W. B. MARRIOTT, B.D., F.S.A. London. 1870.

"WHAT insight," remarks the learned and eloquent Dean Stanley in his "Eastern Churches," "into the familiar feelings and thoughts of the primitive ages of the Church can be compared with that afforded by the Roman Catacombs! Hardly noticed by Gibbon or Mosheim, they yet give us a likeness of those early times beyond that derived from any of the written authorities on which Gibbon or Mosheim repose. . . . The subjects of the sculptures and paintings place before us the exact ideas with which the first Christians were familiar; they remind us, by what they do not contain, of the ideas with which the first Christians were *not* familiar. . . . He who is thoroughly steeped in the imagery of the Catacombs will be nearer to the thoughts of the early Church than he who has learned by heart the most elaborate treatise even of Tertullian or of Origen."

By the study of the inscriptions, paintings, and sculpture of these subterranean cities of the dead we can follow the development of Christian thought from century to century; we can trace the successive changes of doctrine and discipline; we can read the irrefragable testimony, written with a pen of iron in the rock forever, of the simplicity of the primitive faith, and of the gradual corruption which it has undergone.

In this age of Romish assumption and aggression, when the occupant of St. Peter's chair lays claim to personal infallibility of act and word, and invites all Christendom to an Œcumenical Council, not to discuss matters of faith, but merely to bow to the fiat of his will, it may not be inappropriate nor unprofitable to inquire into the credentials of his authority and the alleged sources of his power. In this era of critical investigation of the very foundations of the faith it will be well to examine the vast body of Christian evidences handed down from the believers living in or near the apostolic age, and thus providentially preserved in those subterranean excavations. Christianity has nothing to fear from the comparison of these remains of Christian antiquity with those of the pre-existing Paganism; as little has Protestantism to fear their comparison with the corrupt form of Christianity into which the primitive Church, alas! too soon degenerated. On the one hand may be seen the infinite contrast between the abominable condition of society under the Empire and the purity of life of the early Christians, and on the other the gradual corruption of doctrine and practice as we approach the Byzantine Age.

The discovery of Pompeii and the recent explorations of the Catacombs bring into sharp contrast Christian and pagan civilization. While traversing the deserted streets of the former "two thousand years roll backward," and we stand among the objects familiar to the gaze of the men and maids and matrons of the palmy days of Rome. But what a tale of the prevailing sensuality, what a practical commentary on the scathing denunciations of Juvenal or the light wit of Horace, do we read in the remains of ancient art on every side! Amid the silence and gloom of the Catacombs we are transported again to the dawn of Christianity, and in the pious inscriptions and symbolic paintings we read the sacred truths that sustained the hearts of the martyrs and confessors of the faith amid the fiery trials of that age of persecution. We are brought face to face with the primitive Church, and comprehend more of its spirit and life than from all the writings of the Fathers or the ecclesiastical histories of the times.

Most of the Christian relics, inscriptions, and sculptures are removed from the Catacombs, and are to be found in the numerous museums and churches of Rome, especially in the

Lapidarian Gallery in the Vatican. Both sides of this gallery are completely covered with inscribed slabs plastered into the wall. Those on the right hand are relics of classic times collected in the neighborhood of the city, votive tablets, altar dedications, fragments of edicts, and public documents. On the left are the humble epitaphs of the early Christians, rudely scratched on stone or baked in terra cotta, and brought hither from the Catacombs.

Here the monuments of pagan and of Christian Rome confront each other, and the immense contrast between their diverse characters strikes every beholder. The pride and pomp of worldly power, the majesty of ancient Rome, its lofty titles and earthly distinctions, are all recorded here. The Roman citizen displays on his sepulchral slab the proud array of prænomen, nomen, and cognomen, which attest his lofty social position. Their utter blankness of despair concerning the future, or querulous and passionate complaining against the gods, show how the races without the knowledge of the true God met the awful mystery of death.

On the other side the humble Christian inscriptions, by their rudeness, their brevity, and frequent marks of haste and ignorance, confirm the truth that God chose the weak, the base, the despised things of this world to bring to naught the things that are mighty. The Christian athlete was laid to rest with no vaunting eulogy, and seldom with any indication of his worldly position. Often only a single name, and that the one received at baptism, was engraved on his sepulchral slab; and sometimes even this was omitted, and the simple words *IN PACE* attest that he sleeps in the peace of Christ. On every side breathes the assurance of quiet confidence, of certain hope. On many a sculptured slab or tile we read such words of Christian trust as the following:

DORMIT IN PACE.

He sleeps in peace.

DORMIT SED VIVET.

He sleeps, but lives.

JVSTVS CVM SCIS XPO MEDIANTE

RESVRGET.

Justus, who will rise with the Saints through Christ.

LVCIVS DORMIT ET VIVET
IN PACE XO.

Lucius sleeps and lives in the peace of Christ.

How different the spirit of the pagan inscriptions! Witness the passionate defiance of Fate in the following, given by Mabillon:

PROCOPE · MANVS · LEBO · CONTRA
DEVM · QVI · ME · INNOCENTEM · SVS ·
TVLIT ·

I, Procope, lift up my hands against God, who snatched away me, innocent.

If possible, more painful still is the light Epicurean language of the following:

D · M
TI · CLAVDI · SECVNDI
HIC · SECVM · HABET · OMNIA
BALNEA · VINVM · VENVS
CORRVMPVNT · CORPORA ·
NOSTRA · SED · VITAM · FACIVNT
B · V · V ·

To the divine manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here he enjoys every thing. Baths, wine, and lust ruin our constitutions, but—they make life what it is. Farewell, farewell.

A great deal of useless speculation and of fanciful theory have been indulged in as to the *origin* of the Catacombs. They have been attributed to a prehistoric race of *troglydites*, who loathed the light of day, and burrowed like moles in darkness. It was also supposed that they were originally sand-pits or stone-quarries, which were afterward appropriated to the purposes of sepulture, of worship, and of refuge from danger. The Catacombs of Rome, however, are not excavated in the *tufa lithoide*, from which the building stone was hewn, nor in the more friable *tufa pozzolana*, out of which the sand was dug; but in the *tufa granolare*, an accretion of volcanic scoria of intermediate position and hardness. It is probable, nevertheless, that the early Christians made use of the pre-existing *arenariae* as masks to the entrance of the Catacombs, as we still see at that of S. Agnese, where the passage descending to the subterranean sepulchres dives abruptly down from the old pagan

excavation above. They were doubtless also used as at least partial receptacles for the excavated *debris*, of which it is difficult to conceive how they disposed otherwise.

It is impossible to discover the actual extent of this subterranean city of the dead, rivaling in vastness that of the living above ground, on account of the number and intricacy of its passages. According to Di Rossi, the most recent writer on this subject, there are not less than forty-two separate Catacombs in the vicinity of Rome. They so encompass the city, like a military circumvallation, that they have been called "the encampment of the Christian host besieging Pagan Rome, and driving inward its mines and trenches with the assurance of final victory."

The Catacombs consist of two parts—corridors and chambers, or *cubicula*, as they are technically called. The former are long, narrow, and intricate passages, forming a complete underground net-work. They vary from two to four feet in width, and are from five to twelve feet high, arched, and occasionally plastered. At the corners of these passages there is frequent evidences of lamps having been fixed; indeed, without them they would be an impenetrable labyrinth. The graves are in tiers on either side, like shelves in the wall, and are of all sizes, from an infant's to that of a full grown man. They number from two or three to as many as seven on a side. They are generally closed with tiles of terra cotta or slabs of marble put edgewise in a groove or mortice cut in the rock and fastened with cement, on which the marks of the trowel may be seen as fresh as if made yesterday. Many of the inscriptions are mere scratches on the soft surface of the terra cotta hardened by baking; others are cut in stone. The letters vary from half an inch to four inches high, and are colored with a reddish pigment. Extreme ignorance is often exhibited in the inscriptions. They are frequently characterized by bad spelling, bad grammar, the absence of inflections, the use of prepositions instead, and other indications of a transition state from Latin to Italian.

Most of the graves, or *loculi*, as they are called, are anonymous; many of the important inscriptions have been removed, and frequently in the open tomb may be seen the crumbling skeleton. In one figured in D'Agincourt, the outline of the osseous frame is seen in dust on the bottom of the cell. Verily,

pulvis et umbra sumus! As the pilgrim to these chambers of silence and gloom walks through the vaulted corridors his footsteps echo strangely down the distant passages, the graves yawn weirdly as he passes torch in hand, deep mysterious shadows crouch around, the air is hot and stifling, and seems laden with the dry dust of death.

The *cubicula* are vaulted chambers on either side of the passages, frequently with *arcosolia* or arched tombs in their sides, and are generally of a somewhat decorated character, the roof and sides being adorned with frescoes, often much begrimed with the torches of their numerous visitors. Sometimes these *cubicula* are lighted by openings to the sky called *luminariæ*. Most of these, however, are overgrown with weeds or fallen in through age, and have become objects of danger to horsemen traversing the Campagna. There are frequently two, or even three, tiers of passages in the Catacombs at different levels, like the galleries of a mine.

It is difficult to compute the number of graves in these vast cemeteries. Some seventy thousand have been counted, but these are a mere fraction of the whole. Only a small part of this great necropolis has been explored. Mr. Northcote has made the astounding computation, founded upon an accurate survey of part of the Catacomb of S. Agnese, made under the superintendence of Father Marchi, that in all the Catacombs there must be an aggregate of nine hundred miles of passages, and, allowing five on each side for every seven feet, the enormous number of nearly seven million graves. This seems utterly incredible, but we know that for nearly four centuries almost the entire Christian population of Rome was buried here. And that population, even at an early date, was of great extent. The Christian faith, in spite of repression, continued to spread. The servile classes, of which Roman society was so largely composed, heard with joy the message of emancipation. They sprang up to a sense of human dignity as they learned that they—the “vile plebs” of Rome—were created the heirs of immortality, were redeemed by the blood of Christ, and might become the sons of God. In the Christian Church the distinctions of worldly rank were abolished.* In the inscriptions of

* “Apud nos inter pauperes et divites, servos et dominos interest nihil.”—*Lactant., Div. Inst.*, V, 14, 15.

the Catacombs no badges of servitude, no titles of honor, appear. The wealthy noble—the lord of many acres—recognized in his lowly slave a fellow-heir of glory, and regarded him thenceforth “not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved.” Nay, he may often have bowed to him as his ecclesiastical superior, and received from his plebeian hands the emblems of the broken body of their common Lord. The lowly arenarii and fossors, and the Campagnian husbandmen and vine-dressers, and they “of Cæsar’s household” alike, during the storms of persecution took refuge in these lonely labyrinths, meeting by stealth for the celebration of the rites of their religion, and burying in their silent recesses their holy dead. And there reposed the proto-martyrs and confessors of the faith—the forlorn hope of the army of Christianity—the conscripts for the tomb, their holy dust making a true *terra sancta* of those gloomy vaults. There arose the funeral hymn, the chant of praise, the voice of exhortation or of prayer, no less acceptable to God than if from the stateliest of human temples.

When the age of persecution had passed away, the Catacombs continued invested with a deep and pathetic interest as the cradle of the faith, the refuge of the Church during the storm of calamity, and the sepulcher of the saints and martyrs. It became an object of ambition to share the resting place of those who had been so holy in life and so glorious in death. Hence we find that during the Middle Ages the loftiest dignitaries in Church and State—popes and prelates, princes and nobles, kings and queens, and even some illustrious wearers of the imperial purple—were borne in death to the churches erected over the shrines of the most illustrious martyrs, to share the last long sleep of the confessors of the Christian faith.

When the Church was no longer compelled to the secret observance of the rites of religion subterranean worship was discontinued, save on the memorial occasions of the anniversaries of the martyrs or saints. Commodious entrances were constructed to the Catacombs, easy stair-ways were hewn in the rock, retaining walls were built, and many of the tombs were adorned with Byzantine work of the seventh century. A *basilica* was frequently erected over the entrance to the Catacomb.

During the lawless period from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, when faction, civil war, and anarchy laid waste the country, when even the classic *mausolea* above ground were converted into armed fortresses, these gloomy vaults became the rendezvous of insurgents and conspirators, and therein were hatched those "treasons, stratagems, and spoliations" that devastated the land. Frequently armed bands of the retainers of hostile houses—the Montagues and Capulets of the day—met in these subterranean vaults, and the war-cry of Guelph and Ghibelline rang through the hollow corridors, and bloodshed and cruelty desecrated the spot sacred to religion and the ashes of the sainted dead. Petrarch thus refers to this uneccelesiastical use of the Catacombs:

"Quasi spelunca di ladron son fatti,
Tal ch' à buon solamente uscio se chiude;
E tra le attari, e tra statue ignude,
Ogni impresa crudel par che si tratti." *

In course of time the knowledge of the Catacombs was lost, and it was not till the revival of learning in the sixteenth century had stimulated the minds of men to the study of the past, and the rescue from oblivion of the priceless remains of antiquity, that this treasury of Christian evidences was rediscovered and again thrown open to the investigation of mankind. To Father Antonio Bosio, a Roman priest, is the honor due of unavailing to the sight of Europe the ancient monuments of the faith buried in their depths. Sustained by a lofty enthusiasm, he spent thirty-three years groping among those gloomy corridors, deciphering the half-effaced inscriptions, and making drawings of the remains of early Christian art. So habituated did he become to this trogloditic existence that the Cimmerian gloom of the Catacombs was more grateful to his eyes than the light of day, which dazzled and almost blinded him. He was not permitted, however, to see the publication of his great work, in which he disclosed to the world the *terra incognita* lying so long hidden beneath the busy life of the Eternal City. He died while writing the last chapter of his learned work, *Roma Sot-*

* They are become like robbers' caves,
So that only the good are denied an entrance;
And among altars and saintly statues
Every cruel enterprise seems to be concerted.—*Canzone, xi.*

terranea. It was not published till 1632, thirty years after its author's death.

In the years 1651-59 this work was republished in Rome, in two large folio volumes, by Father Aringhi, a learned antiquarian, who translated it into Latin, and added numerous original discoveries of his own. A collection of Christian epitaphs from the Catacombs was published by Fabretti in 1702, but the next important work was the *Osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri dei Santi Martiri, . . . di Roma*, a large folio by Father Boldetti, *custode* of the Catacombs. This learned work was also the result of thirty years' personal exploration. The literature of this subject now becomes more voluminous. In 1737 and 1754 were issued from the Vatican press three large folio volumes by the learned Bottari, entitled *Sculture e pitture sagre, estratte dai Cimiteri di Roma*. The next original explorer in those mines of Christian antiquity was M. D'Agincourt, an eminent French archæologist. He came to Rome near the close of the last century with the intention of spending six months in the study of the Catacombs. But the absorbing interest of the study grew upon him, and he remained for fifty years collecting the materials for his magnificent and posthumous work entitled *Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens*. In recent times the subject has been ably treated by M. Raoul Rochette in his *Tableau des Catacombs de Rome*, by the Abbé Gaume in his *Les Trois Romes*, and by the Abbé Gerbet in his *Rome Chrétienne*. In 1844 appeared the *Architettura della Roma Sotterranea Christiana* of Father Marchi, a distinguished member of the Collegio Romano. In 1852-57 appeared the magnificent work, in six volumes, of M. Louis Perret, who spent six years in its preparation. This superb work of art, however, is rather untrustworthy, as an account of the real state of the Catacombs, by reason of the very artistic excellence and force of its illustrations. The most recent and important work on the subject is the Cavalier Di Rossi's *Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ Septimo Sæculo Antiquiores*, 1857-61, and *Roma Sotterranea*, (in Italian,) 1864. These are a monument of faithful scholarship, and the authority for most of the remaining part of this paper.

The first English Protestant writer on this subject was Dr. Charles Maitland, whose "Church in the Catacombs" is a work

of great interest, though uncritical and frequently inexact, and necessarily incomplete, being a quarter of a century old. The most important discoveries are those of the last ten or even five years. M'Farlane's "Catacombs of Rome" is a useful little compendium of the subject, (although erroneous as to the origin of these structures,) as also is Mr. Spencer Northcote's book. Cardinal Wiseman's "Fabiola" is a beautifully written tale of the Church in the Catacombs, of course taking strong Romish views on all disputed points. Bishop Kip's book is a very convenient little digest, principally from Maitland, and adopting his now abandoned theories. Dr. M'Caul's admirable volume on "Christian Epitaphs of the First Six Centuries" incidentally treats the topic in hand. It is not confined to the Catacombs, however, but includes Christian epitaphs from every source. It is a work of profound scholarship, and is a very important contribution to the science of epigraphy. Some of the learned author's expansions and interpretations of mere fragments, in this work and in another on Britano-Romano inscriptions, are very ingenious, and seem less the result of a process of reasoning than of a sort of happy inspiration, or rather divination. Mr. Marriott's book consists of two brief monographs on the development of the *cultus* of Mary, and the supremacy of the See of Rome from the second to the eighteenth century, and one on the remarkable ichthyic inscription discovered at Autun in France.

It is, however, the religious teachings of the Catacombs that are of greatest interest to us. To this subject, therefore, the remainder of this article shall be devoted.

Rome lays especial claim to the Christian antiquities of the Catacombs as evidences of the apostolic character of her peculiar rites and usages; but Protestantism need have no fear of the results of their closest investigation. The science of epigraphy is decidedly opposed to her claims. There is not a single inscription, nor painting, nor sculpture, before the middle of the fourth century, that lends the least countenance to her arrogant assumptions and erroneous dogmas. All previous to this date are remarkable for the evangelical nature of their doctrine, and it is only in the fifth and sixth centuries, in the degeneracy of the Byzantine Age, that the peculiar features of Romanism become apparent.

There are some eleven thousand sepulchral inscriptions of the early Christians which have been discovered at Rome. These are of the greatest interest and importance as illustrating the doctrines and discipline, the rites and institutions, of the primitive Church, and the Christian life and character of the early centuries, of which they are almost the only records. They throw light on much that is obscure in early ecclesiastical history, and explain difficulties which would otherwise prove insoluble.

Let us examine a few of the earliest inscriptions and see how far they warrant the assumptions of Rome.

On a sarcophagus of the date A. D. 217 we read after the name of the deceased the words :

PROSENES RECEPVS AD DEVM.

This is the first trace of doctrine that we discover, and it assuredly is not the doctrine of purgatory. The soul is "received near to God," into his immediate presence.

An inscription of the year 235, in the cemetery of Lucina, bears the words :

AVRELIA DVLCISSIMA FILIA QUAE DE SAECULO RECESSIT.

The word *dulcissima*, "most sweet," is very common in the Catacombs, and is eminently appropriate to the Christian character. In the expression *de saeculo recessit*, "retired from the age or world," we read a strong assurance of immortality, and the confident hope of another country, even a heavenly.

In A. D. 238, accompanying a Greek inscription on a sarcophagus, the touching representation of the Good Shepherd with the lost sheep upon his shoulders for the first time appears. Few figures recur more frequently in the Catacombs than this. It here appears with the utmost simplicity, with no sign of the idolatrous veneration afterward paid to the representation of Christ, not even the conventional halo around his head.

In A. D. 268 or 279, it was not absolutely decided which, on a slab from the cemetery of S. Calixtus appears this legend :

VIBAS INTER SANCTIS IHA.

What the last word means is not very apparent ; but Romanists lay great stress upon the expression, "May you live among the blessed !" as an indubitable instance of intercession for the dead.

Only a mind intensely prepossessed with that idea could discern aught here than the natural language of affection desiring the happiness of the beloved one.

In A. D. 269 we find the next inscription in the cemetery of S. Saturninus. It is written in Latin, though with Greek characters of very unequal size and uncouth form, and certifies that "Leuce erected (this memorial) to her very dear daughter and to thy holy spirit,"—*εδ ειςπειρειτο σανκτω τουω*, that is, *et spirito (spiritui) sancto tuo*. This has evidently no reference to the Romish doctrine of canonization, but merely attests the sanctity of character of the person interred. This inscription is evidently the production of extreme ignorance, as is indicated by the wretched grammar and orthography and the incoherent meaning.

In A. D. 291 we find the last dated epitaph of the third century. It asserts, in ill-spelled and ungrammatical Latin, that Macervonia Silvania lived well and innocently with her Virginus. This is followed by the expression, *Refrigera cum spirita sancta*, "Refresh thyself with the holy ones," in which Roman controversialists have discovered the doctrine of purgatory and the invocation of the saints—with what success we leave it to every impartial reader to judge. And this is all—absolutely all—of a doctrinal character to be discovered in the first three centuries, in the ages of the purity of the faith. Many of the subsequent inscriptions, even of a comparatively late date, are of a highly evangelical character; and, if all other records were destroyed, from these alone might be reconstructed the theology and internal organization of the primitive Church.

The first inscription which is clearly favorable to any of the Romish doctrines is of date from 366 to 384. It is the eloquent epitaph at the entrance of the Catacomb of S. Agnese, written by Pope Damasus in honor of the youthful martyr. He unquestionably invokes the assistance of the saint in the line:

UT DAMASI PRECIBUS FAVEAS PRECOR INCLYTA MARTYR—

O illustrious martyr, I beseech thee to aid the prayers of Damasus.

This is Romish doctrine, it is true, but it only shows the departure from the primitive faith in the latter part of the fourth century. In vain Rome searches all her vast museums,

and the rich treasury of the Catacombs, for evidence in favor of her unscriptural dogmas. She can find no better foundation on which to erect her superstructure of error than that which we have cited. "All the epitaphs," says a writer in the *Revue Chrétienne*, "favorable to Roman dogmas are without date or posterior to the year 350, and the evangelical character of those which are anterior authorizes us to believe that those which have not this character are of an epoch nearer to us than the middle of the fourth century."

If the evidence from inscriptions in favor of Roman doctrines is so meager, that from the arrangement and furniture of the Catacombs is still more so. In some of the chambers, or *cubicula*, into which the passages expand, are found *arcosolia*, or tombs built in a recess excavated in the wall, which may be readily described as resembling an arched fire-place built half-way up. In these the Roman archæologists have discovered altars for the celebration of the sacrifice of the mass. The development of the sacrificial idea in the eucharist is too wide a subject to be here entered upon; but there is abundant evidence that it formed no part of the theology of the Church of the Catacombs.

In some of the *cubicula* stone chairs, occurring sometimes in pairs, have been found. The Romanists confidently assert that these were confessionals! But they are too far apart from each other if one was designed for the confessor and the other for the penitent, and too close if each seat was a separate confessional. Many circumstances conspire to indicate their true purpose to have been for the accommodation of the male and female catechists who instructed the catechumens of the primitive Church.

The date of the paintings in the Catacombs is more readily deducible from their style than that of the inscriptions, those of the early period being much superior in artistic merit. Their design is more correct, their ornamentation more chaste and elegant, and the accessories more graceful. The converse of this is true of Byzantine Art, to which class the later paintings belong.

One of the earliest subjects represented in the Catacombs is the Good Shepherd. He is generally represented as a beardless youth in a short tunic and buskins, with the lost sheep

upon his shoulders, as the Roman shepherds carry them to this day. This simple figure continually recalls that sweet Hebrew idyl of which the world will never grow tired, to which our Lord lent a deeper pathos by the parable of the lost sheep.

On many of the tombs is a figure standing erect with outstretched hands, in prayer. This was evidently the primitive posture. By the twentieth canon of the Council of Nice kneeling at prayer was forbidden, and, according to Dean Stanley, all the Eastern Churches stand at prayer to this day. Indeed, it was considered a penance to be compelled to kneel. "*Hic habitus orantium est*," says Apuleius, "*ut manibus in cælum extensis precemur*." Is this what Paul meant when he willed that men "should pray every-where, *lifting up* holy hands?" Sometimes the figure is that of a woman, but never accompanied by the Divine Child or any other symbol of the Virgin Mary. To some of these the Romanists gave the name of the Madonna, without the least ground for differentiating these particular examples from numerous others in which the figures are regarded as representing the person interred.

The principal scenes represented in the paintings and sarcophagi are simple Scripture history, and, singularly enough, more frequently derived from the Old Testament than from the New.

What is chiefly remarkable in these groups is the conspicuous absence of those representations of the passion of our Lord, so common in later Catholic art, and the rare occurrence of the Virgin Mary. Only one example of the former—Christ crowned with thorns—was found in two hundred and sixty-nine Scripture groups, and only three of the Nativity, in which the Virgin Mother appears only as an accessory to the Divine Child, and not the central object. In the adoration of the Magi she appears more frequently, but in no case is she represented in the Catacombs as an object of religious homage.

The absence of those gross, anthropomorphic representations of the Deity into which later art degenerated is also remarkable. All who are familiar with mediæval art will recall many painful examples of this offense against piety and good taste, to which not even the majestic genius of Michael Angelo can reconcile us. The writer remembers a

representation of the creation of Eve, in which the Almighty, in ecclesiastical garb, with the triple crown of Rome upon his head and a lantern in his hand, is extracting the rib from the sleeping form of Adam. In Germany he was represented as Emperor, in England and France as King. The daring artists of the Middle Ages even attempted to represent the incomprehensible mystery of the Trinity by a grotesque head with three faces joined together. According to M. Emeric David, in his *Discours sur les Anciens Monumens*, the French artists of the ninth century claim the "happy boldness"—*heureuse hardiesse*—of first representing the Almighty under human form. We find nothing of this in the Catacombs. The nearest approach thereto is a single hand stretched out to arrest the knife of Abraham about to offer up Isaac, and a hand encircled with clouds, as if more strongly to signify its symbolic character, giving the tables of the law to Moses.

The symbolism of the Catacombs is wholly of a cheering and inspiring character. The most frequently recurring figure is that of a dove, generally bearing the olive-branch—the synonym of peace. On the more ancient sarcophagi are sculptured chiefly harvest, vintage, or hunting scenes, or pastoral groups with numerous little figures of genii after the classic manner. It is evident that the Christian artist had not freed himself from the influence of conventional pagan types.

The ship is also a frequent and appropriate symbol of life, as it was also in pagan art. It is referred to by St. Clement as *ἡ ναὺς οὐρανόραμον*, by St. Peter in his epistle, and in our own baptismal service. It is frequently of the rudest form, doubtless an imitation of the barges on the Tiber.

One of the most frequent symbols of the Catacombs is a fish, an especial favorite from the fact that its letters (ΙΧΘΥΣ) were the initials of the name and title of our Lord—*Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ*; and also, says St. Augustine, because they were the initial letters of certain prophetic lines attributed to the Sibyl of Erythra. "The fish," Tertullian rather fancifully remarks, "seems a fit emblem of Him whose spiritual children are like the offspring of fishes, born in the water of baptism;" and St. Clement recommends its use, as "such a sign will prevent them from forgetting their origin."

The remains of pagan influence are seen in the frequent recur-

rence of the classic formula D. M., (*dis manibus*.) Sometimes, indeed, this results from the use of slabs on which pagan inscriptions had been cut—*tabulæ opisthographæ*, as they are called. But generally they are used in careless retention of a heathen formula. Many other symbols which were originally heathen acquired a conventional Christian signification, as the wreath, the palm, the anchor, the stag, the peacock, and phoenix, as shadowing forth the resurrection; and Orpheus, who was thought a type of Christ by the sweetness of his preaching drawing all men after him, and probably also as prefiguring him in his descent into the under-world.

But more common than any other Christian symbol is the sacred monogram formed by the junction of the Greek characters X and P, the first two letters of the word *Χριστός*, or Christ. This was probably derived from the well known *Labarum* of Constantine, as the first dated example appears in the Catacombs in A. D. 339. There were, however, previous approximate forms, and it might easily originate from the prevalent practice of contraction and monogrammatic writing. It is frequently accompanied by the letters A and Ω, in allusion to the well known passage in the Revelations; and is then to be read, "In Christ, the First and the Last." The ignorance of the artist is sometimes exhibited by the reversing of the order of these letters.

The changing of this monogram into the cross was very gradual. First, one stroke of the X became coincident with the vertical part of the P, and the other stroke at right angles to it. Then the curved part of the P was omitted, and a truncated or Greek cross was formed. It thus gradually assumed its present form, but was still a sign of joy and gladness, bearing only a dove or a wreath of flowers—the Christian's pledge of peace and victory. It was only by slow degrees that it became the thing of tears and agony, splashed with blood, and bearing the thorn-crowned Christ, that we find in the Middle Ages. About the year 400, a lamb, type of the *Agnus Dei*, is seen at the foot of the cross, a sacrificial emblem to bring the atonement more vividly to mind. As the shadows of the Dark Ages gather, this beautiful symbol gives place to a living man; and in the year 706 the Quinisextan Council ordained, "That the representation of Christ, our God, be henceforward set up and painted

in the place of the ancient lamb." At first he is seen standing beneath the cross with outstretched arms, as if in prayer. In the deeper darkness of the ninth century he is raised to the level of the transverse beam, but still lives and prays with hands unconfined. It is not till the tenth century that Christ is represented as hanging lifeless on the cross, his hands and feet transfixed with nails; and in the thirteenth, his head droops heavily on one side. His dress, which at the first extended from the neck to the feet, becomes reduced at last to a narrow drapery about his loins.

The expression of countenance of the Redeemer also underwent a change—a dire eclipse of woe—no less painful to trace. All the divine fades away, and only the human agony of the wan and furrowed face remains. The serene and joyous aspect which he wears in the Catacombs has vanished, and he is represented as the "man of sorrows," crushed with hopeless grief; and art exhausts itself in the delineation of the intensest forms of anguished suffering. Lecky attributes this degradation of art to the latent Manichæanism of the Dark Ages, to the monkish fear of beauty as a deadly temptation, and to the terrible pictures of Dante which opened up such an abyss of horrors to the imagination—how different from the glorious visions of St. John! But thus at least, in an imaginative age, would be brought vividly before the rude intellect of the times an intense conception of the passion of our Lord.

But the cross was as yet only a painting, not a crucifix. The creation of this was the work of the sculptors. In the tenth century the passion was represented in bas-relief, which gradually became more and more detached from the wall, sarcophagus, or altar, passing through the stages of *mezzo* and *alto-relievo*, till in the fourteenth century it stood out the completed crucifix. From this, through rapid stages, we arrive at the gross and ghastly representations which disfigure every continental cathedral and every way-side, from the gilt and jeweled crucifix on the high altar to the wooden rood from which the uncouth carved image of Christ, crowned with a crown of real thorns, and often in popular superstition endowed with the power of weeping, of motion, of speech, and of working miracles, looks down on an adoring multitude. Hither comes the bandit or the murderer, red-handed from his deed of blood,

and thinks by a muttered *Ave* or *Paternoster* to atone for his crime.

As little do we find in the Catacombs in favor of the worship of the Virgin, which is so strikingly characteristic of modern Romanism. We discover no *Ave Maria* or *Ora pro nobis* addressed to Mary as the intercessor with God. The first certain representation of the Virgin Mary does not occur till the fourth century, and it is not common till the sixth. Even then she appears, not as the principal figure, much less as an object of adoration, but only as accessory to the Divine infant, frequently veiled from head to foot; never as the mournful *mater dolorosa*, or with the transpierced heart of the later artists, but rather as the "blessed among women."

We have seen how utterly baseless are the Romish figments of purgatory, invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead. The celibacy of the clergy, another cherished, and, as all history proves, most pernicious dogma of the Church, is also disproved by numerous inscriptions in the Catacombs, in which Presbyters and Bishops lament the death of their wives, "chaste, just, and holy." "Would to God," says a writer in the *Revue Chrétienne*, "that all their successors had such!" Here is a characteristic epitaph from Aringhi, (Lib. III, c. iii):

LEVITAE CONIVNX PETRONIA FORMA PVDORIS.

Petronia, a priest's wife, the type of modesty.

This was in the Consulate of Festus, as late as 472.

But not only does the teaching of the Catacombs show us what was *not* the practice of the primitive Church; it gives us also many illustrations of its ministry and rites.

The office of Bishop is indicated by the words *επ*, *επι*, and *επισ* on several tombs. We have also epitaphs of "Presbyters," "Levites," "Pastors," and "Deacons." We read, too, inscriptions to "Lectors," whose duty it was to read the Scriptures aloud in the church. Julian the Apostate in his youth was lector in the Church of Nicomedia.* Often children were dedicated to this office in their tender youth. We read an epitaph of one "who lived twelve years, more or less"—*plus minus*. The latter is a very common expression.

* Ως καὶ κλήρω ἐγκαταλεγῆναι, καὶ ὑπαναγινώσκειν τῷ λαῷ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς βίβλους — *Sozom.*, Lib. V, cap. ii.

Another office now unknown was that of exorcists, originally Jewish, apparently, but early incorporated into the Christian Church.*

The fossors, according to St. Jerome,† were the "first order among the clergy, who, after the example of the holy Tobias, are admonished to bury the dead." They are frequently depicted in the Catacombs, surrounded by the instruments of their art.

There are also indications in the Catacombs of the existence of a female diaconate, and the employment of widows in offices of charity. This fact is confirmed by ecclesiastical history. The order of *ministrae* is recognized by the Council of Chalcedon, and its members restricted to those over forty years of age. Thus we have in the inscriptions the expressions, "widow of God," "handmaid of God," and "a consecrated virgin."

The care of the primitive Church for the young is indicated in the epitaph of a catechumen who died under the age of ten years. The frequent mention of "neophytes" of tender years indicates that the rite of baptism, by which they were admitted to the Church, was administered in infancy. One of these epitaphs is to a child of three years and thirty days, and another to one of twenty-one months.

In addition to the holy eucharist another rite, preserved in modern times we believe only in the Methodist community and among the Moravian brethren, is commemorated in the Catacombs. This is the *agape* or "feast of charity" mentioned in the Epistle of Jude. In the Catacomb of Marcellinus is a painting representing this feast. Two matrons, over whose heads are inscribed the words IRENE and AGAPE, preside. The guests are supplied with food from a small table supporting a lamb and a cup. To this Tertullian refers in the words: "Our supper by its name, which is the Greek for *love*, displays its character. . . . We so eat as having to worship God by night; we so talk as knowing that the Lord hears. After washing our hands and bringing lights, each is called upon to sing to God according to his power, either from holy Scripture or from his

* Unus de exorcistis, inspiratus Dei gratia fortiter restitit, et esse illum nequissimum, spiritum, qui prius sanctus putabatur, ostendit.—*Firmil., ep ad Cyp.*, 75.

† Primus in clericis fossariorum ordo est, etc.—*De Septem. Ordin. Eccles.*

own composition. Prayer also concludes the feast."* In course of time this beautiful custom became subject to abuse, and was finally suppressed by the decree of the Quinisextan Council; A. D. 706.

We have thus endeavored to give a faithful representation of the doctrinal teaching of the Catacombs. We have seen how identical it is with that of holy Scripture, how opposed to all the dogmas of Rome. We have only to compare the buried relics of the past with the living present above ground to see at a glance the infinite contrast between the Church of Christ and that of Antichrist. In all things, both in Church and State, what a change has taken place! The leopard no longer leaps in the Flavian amphitheater, nor the ribald "plebs" of Rome utter their vociferous cry, "*Christiani ad leones!*"† The flame of sacrifice to the supreme Jove no longer ascends from the Capitoline Hill, nor the haruspices augur from the flight of birds, or from the smoking entrails of sacrificial victims. Instead of this from four hundred cross-crowned campaniles baptized and consecrated bells toll forth the hour of prayer; on a thousand altars the multitude adore, they vainly think, the real presence of the Redeemer, and chant and anthem evermore ascend not to the gods of the Pantheon, but to the still more numerous saints of the Roman calendar.

Yet a blight seems to rest upon all things. The degenerate Roman of to-day creeps sluggishly along the road constructed over two thousand years ago by the Censor Appius Claudius. Upon the solid basalt pavement along which marched the legions that conquered the world now lumbers an occasional *diligence*. The great imperial city has dwindled from a population of two millions to less than one tenth of that number. The gardens, palaces, and stately villas, where Roman courtiers, wits, and poets dreamed life away in an elysium of pleasure, have given place to the desolation of the Campagna. Across the far horizon stretch the broken arches of a ruined aqueduct, gleaming in the twilight, vast and shadowy, like a spectral procession of the vanished deities of Rome. But

* *Apologeticus*, cap. 39. Ita saturantur, ut qui meninerient etiam per noctem adorandum sibi esse; ita fabulantur, ut qui sciunt, dominum, audire, etc.

† Tertull. *Apol.*, cap. xv.

nature is unchanged, and the golden sunlight falls, and the sapphire sea expands, and the purple hills of Albano stretch into the distance as fair and lovely as of yore.

Yet beneath the living death that cumpers the ground, in those chambers of silence which we have been studying, we find the evidences of that undying life of Christianity for which we seek in vain in that city of churches, the Apostolic See of Christendom—the vaunted seat of Christ's vicegerent upon earth. We turn away from the gorgeous ritual, the stately pomp, the sublime music, the porphyry pillars and the frescoed arches of the Sistine Chapel, with its powerful hierarchy of priests, prelates, and Cardinals, to the lowly chambers of the Catacombs, where the Christian hymn of a persecuted remnant of the saints ascended from beside the martyr's grave, as the truer type of Christ's spiritual temple upon earth. With a deeper significance than that with which it was first uttered we adopt the language of Tertullian, and exclaim, *Id est verum, quodcunque primum; id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius*: "Whatever is first is true; whatever is more recent is spurious." *

* Tertull., Adv. Prax., Oper. ii, p. 405.

NOTE.—The entire subject of Christian evidences from the Catacombs, which has been so cursorily glanced at in the foregoing article, is treated with great fullness of detail and copious pictorial illustration in a work by the present writer, now in course of publication by Messrs. Carlton and Lanahan, entitled, "The Catacombs of Rome, and their Testimony relative to Primitive Christianity." It discusses at length the structure, origin, and history of the Catacombs; their art and symbolism; their epigraphy as illustrative of the theology, ministry, rites, and institutions of the primitive Church, and Christian life and character in the early ages. The gradual corruption of doctrine and practice and introduction of Romanist errors, as the *cultus* of Mary, the primacy of Peter, prayers for the dead, the invocation of saints, the notion of purgatory, the celibacy of the clergy, rise of monastic orders, and other allied subjects are fully treated.

ART. III.—EARLY METHODISM IN THE WEST.

THE early settlers of the West entered the great Mississippi Valley on two diverging lines of travel. One led through the defiles of Virginia and the Cumberland Gap into the Holston and French Broad territory, extending thence westward and northward into Tennessee and Kentucky; the other across the Alleghany Mountains through the Redstone country, and along the region of the upper Ohio and the Kanawhas. Along the shores of the "Beautiful River" the immigrants met and mingled. Hardy and intrepid, they labored side by side for the same civilization, nurtured the same sentiments of national faith, and fought for the same freedom. This was their inheritance, and they divided it among them.

Hard after the pioneer settlers trod the pioneer Methodist itinerants. Almost before clearings were made or cabins erected, and long before the savage was subdued and Indian hostilities had ceased, the preacher was tracking his way from settlement to settlement, and hunting up the lost sheep of his Master's fold. The first cismontane preacher was Jeremiah Lambert, who traveled the Holston Circuit in 1783. Four years later the work was extended, comprehending the Nolachucky Circuit and the entire State of Kentucky and the Cumberland region. Eight preachers now traveled in the West. When the Western Conference met in October, 1800, fifteen preachers were appointed for the entire Western country. We may get some idea of the extent of their circuits by examining the appointments. Henry Smith's circuit embraced all of Southern Ohio between the Scioto and the Miami rivers. Benjamin Lakin traveled in Northern Kentucky, between Maysville and the Licking River; William Burke's circuit extended a hundred miles each way in Central Kentucky; while the Presiding Elder, William M'Kendree, superintended the entire work, comprising portions of Virginia, East and Middle Tennessee, all Kentucky, and as much of Ohio as was then settled.

The only mode of traveling was on horseback; and as there were no graded highways, and the roads merely traced out,

when located at all, their passage was difficult in the extreme. Besides, the streams were not bridged; only occasionally were there any ferries, and these only on the principal thoroughfares of travel; and as for houses of entertainment, there were very few or none at all, unless we regard every house an inn, and every settler a host. Hospitality was one of the virtues of the pioneers; and, scanty as were the accommodations, few who inquired for a meal's victuals or a night's lodging were turned away unfed or uncared for. Consider, too, the modes of life at that early day. The settlers dwelt mostly in cabins built of round logs, notched down at the corners, and rendered tight by "chinking" the spaces between the logs with billets of wood, and "daubing" them over with mortar or clay. The floors, if any were laid, were constructed of "puncheons," or thick slabs split out of logs, hewed smooth on one side, and secured to the joists by great wooden pins. The windows were made by sawing out a log, and in cold weather white paper was tacked across the opening and greased. When there was snow on the ground it was no uncommon thing for the paper to be pecked into holes by the half-starving birds. Glazed windows, with few lights and small panes, were soon introduced, and they added greatly to the comfort and convenience of the inmates.

The doors of the cabin were made of rough split boards, hung on wooden hinges, and fastened by a wooden latch drawn by a string or leather thong. One room was all that the cabins usually possessed; but there was commonly a loft, reached by a ladder, in which pallets were spread for the children. The fire-place was always a capacious one, occupying nearly the entire width of the cabin. It was constructed of stone and mud, bricks being a thing unknown, and the chimney was formed of split billets, piled alternately at right angles in a stack, as a cooper piles his staves for drying, and then well daubed on both sides with clay to prevent their taking fire. The hearth was large and roomy, so as to afford a sufficient protection against the sparks of fire which were apt to snap out from the ample logs. Over the hearth, and around the rude jambs, poured such a stream of light down the wide-mouthed chimney that windows were scarcely required for either light or ventilation.

After saw-mills were erected these wooden houses were more

neatly constructed, and the number of rooms increased, as partitions could more easily be made. The logs were hewed, the floors were laid smoother, and stair-ways to the lofts were built. Cupboards, shelves, and mantels were also introduced.

The cabins had no cellars; but fruits, milk, etc., were preserved in out-sheds and spring-houses, an excavation being made in the ground and the logs built over it, with the soil thrown out of the hole heaped up against it. Sometimes pent-houses were built against the cabin itself, the soil beneath them being removed to the depth of two or three feet, and heaped against the leaning boards which formed the shed. There was a door at one end; and as it was placed on the north side of the house, or in the shade of trees and shrubbery, it was sufficiently cool to keep milk sweet for two or three days, even in the sultry weather.

The dress of the people was mostly domestic cotton or homespun linsey-woolsey. The Methodist ministers wore a suit of these simple fabrics, the fashion being of the plainest cut, and sometimes quite odd. The notion that dressing like citizens generally was conformity to the world was quite prevalent in the Methodist societies, and an affected singularity in dress was regarded as distinctive a badge of the Methodists as it was of the followers of George Fox. The preachers were expected to wear straight-breasted coats, high-standing collars, long waist-coats, the plainest of neck-ties or cravats, and even to dispense with suspenders; while the laity were admonished to leave off all show or ornament, and to observe the letter of the general rule of Discipline which forbids the putting on of gold and costly apparel. Even tucks and ruffles on children's frocks were discountenanced; ringlets and curls in the hair, though natural, were frowned on; and rings and artificial flowers banished from a lady's attire.

Few and simple were the household utensils. An assortment of pewter dishes, basins, and mugs, or dishes of earthenware, were the most common; but if a family were provided with queen's-ware they were considered well off indeed. Porcelain and china were almost unheard of; and if a lady's sideboard could boast of a single porcelain cup or pitcher it was regarded as remarkably well furnished, and its proud possessor classed among the higher ranks of fashionable society.

The furniture consisted of common board tables, ash or hickory split-bottom chairs, and bedsteads of domestic manufacture. These last were originally made stationary by mortising the rails in the logs of the cabin, and connecting them with an upright post fastened in the floor. Slats, or thin boards, were then laid across for the bedding to rest upon. The mattresses were usually filled with straw, and the beds were covered with neat wrought quilts or home-woven coverlets. A well made and clean bed, with tasteful quilts, high bolsters, snowy sheets and large blankets, was the greatest pride of a neat housekeeper.

It was among such a people, and into the midst of such manners, that Methodism was introduced. A few families belonging to the Methodist societies had settled here and there throughout the West, and in some instances they were organized into classes by zealous local preachers; but no effort at keeping up the worship and usages of the Church regularly was made until they were visited by the itinerant ministers. Our people were mostly poor, and though they raised enough on their farms to eat and to wear, they were seldom blessed with means to afford any thing better than the most meager support to their preachers; yet they kindly received and entertained them in their houses, and often supplied them with food and fuel when they could not dispense to them from their hard-earned money.

The meetings were held in private houses, except occasionally where a meeting-house had been erected in the more populous settlements. But the residences of the pioneers were small—perhaps twenty feet square might be reckoned as the average size of the single cabins. So welcome were the visits of the traveling preacher that their houses were freely opened for public worship and other religious exercises; and it was no uncommon thing for men and women to walk every week five or six miles to attend a class-meeting, and at night the same distance to a prayer-meeting, lighting their way through the woods with blazing fagots of hickory bark instead of a lantern. In summer the men and boys often attended the meetings in their bare feet; and the women and girls, if they could afford shoes and stockings, carried them in their hands until they came within sight of the place of meeting, when they washed off the dust in the nearest brook or spring, and finished their toilets,

that they might appear more decent in meeting ; but as soon as the services were over and they set out on their return, their feet were again stripped bare, and in this condition they traveled oftentimes many miles ; and the distance was seldom too great, or the roads too bad, to prevent these devoted disciples from being in their places when the Gospel was preached.

Services were held on week-days as well as on Sunday. In a circuit of four weeks the preacher might have a sermon to preach every day at one or another point, until, at the close of the time, the circuit was again commenced, and the same exercises were proceeded with in the same order.

But the Quarterly Meetings, when the sacraments were administered and love-feasts held, were the great occasions of religious interest among the pioneer Methodists, as they still are on the larger country circuits. People of both sexes, when the season was favorable and the weather warm enough, would come from twenty or thirty miles' distance—many on foot—and find some hospitable neighbor to entertain them during the continuance of the meeting. Such hospitality never was wanting. The kind Christian friends in whose vicinity a Quarterly Meeting was to be held would for days beforehand make provision for it. A large stock of provisions was wont to be laid in ; the larders were well supplied with bread, cakes, and pies ; while butter, eggs, fresh meat, and perhaps poultry, were made ready against the time for the welcome guests ; and a wealthy member would thus be prepared to entertain as many as fifteen or twenty of his acquaintances. The venerable Philip Gatch, of Clermont county, Ohio, makes mention of these popular meetings, many of which were held in the Forks of the Little Miami.* “It was a matter of astonishment,” says he, “to see the numbers that attended. Women would walk twenty, and even thirty, miles to attend them. The whole care devolved on three families ; each would have frequently to provide for from fifty to a hundred people.” At night the house was given up to the women, who slept on pallets or beds strewn over the floor ; the owner himself, with his male friends, sleeping in the nicely swept and carefully prepared barn, being distributed around in the hay-mow, or on extemporary mattresses of straw on the thrashing-floor.

* Memoirs of Gatch, by Hon. John McLean, LL.D., page 108.

The furniture consisted of common board tables, ash or hickory split-bottom chairs, and bedsteads of domestic manufacture. These last were originally made stationary by mortising the rails in the logs of the cabin, and connecting them with an upright post fastened in the floor. Slats, or thin boards, were then laid across for the bedding to rest upon. The mattresses were usually filled with straw, and the beds were covered with neat wrought quilts or home-woven coverlets. A well made and clean bed, with tasteful quilts, high bolsters, snowy sheets and large blankets, was the greatest pride of a neat housekeeper.

It was among such a people, and into the midst of such manners, that Methodism was introduced. A few families belonging to the Methodist societies had settled here and there throughout the West, and in some instances they were organized into classes by zealous local preachers; but no effort at keeping up the worship and usages of the Church regularly was made until they were visited by the itinerant ministers. Our people were mostly poor, and though they raised enough on their farms to eat and to wear, they were seldom blessed with means to afford any thing better than the most meager support to their preachers; yet they kindly received and entertained them in their houses, and often supplied them with food and fuel when they could not dispense to them from their hard-earned money.

The meetings were held in private houses, except occasionally where a meeting-house had been erected in the more populous settlements. But the residences of the pioneers were small—perhaps twenty feet square might be reckoned as the average size of the single cabins. So welcome were the visits of the traveling preacher that their houses were freely opened for public worship and other religious exercises; and it was no uncommon thing for men and women to walk every week five or six miles to attend a class-meeting, and at night the same distance to a prayer-meeting, lighting their way through the woods with blazing fagots of hickory bark instead of a lantern. In summer the men and boys often attended the meetings in their bare feet; and the women and girls, if they could afford shoes and stockings, carried them in their hands until they came within sight of the place of meeting, when they washed off the dust in the nearest brook or spring, and finished their toilets,

that they might appear more decent in meeting; but as soon as the services were over and they set out on their return, their feet were again stripped bare, and in this condition they traveled oftentimes many miles; and the distance was seldom too great, or the roads too bad, to prevent these devoted disciples from being in their places when the Gospel was preached.

Services were held on week-days as well as on Sunday. In a circuit of four weeks the preacher might have a sermon to preach every day at one or another point, until, at the close of the time, the circuit was again commenced, and the same exercises were proceeded with in the same order.

But the Quarterly Meetings, when the sacraments were administered and love-feasts held, were the great occasions of religious interest among the pioneer Methodists, as they still are on the larger country circuits. People of both sexes, when the season was favorable and the weather warm enough, would come from twenty or thirty miles' distance—many on foot—and find some hospitable neighbor to entertain them during the continuance of the meeting. Such hospitality never was wanting. The kind Christian friends in whose vicinity a Quarterly Meeting was to be held would for days beforehand make provision for it. A large stock of provisions was wont to be laid in; the larders were well supplied with bread, cakes, and pies; while butter, eggs, fresh meat, and perhaps poultry, were made ready against the time for the welcome guests; and a wealthy member would thus be prepared to entertain as many as fifteen or twenty of his acquaintances. The venerable Philip Gatch, of Clermont county, Ohio, makes mention of these popular meetings, many of which were held in the Forks of the Little Miami.* "It was a matter of astonishment," says he, "to see the numbers that attended. Women would walk twenty, and even thirty, miles to attend them. The whole care devolved on three families; each would have frequently to provide for from fifty to a hundred people." At night the house was given up to the women, who slept on pallets or beds strewn over the floor; the owner himself, with his male friends, sleeping in the nicely swept and carefully prepared barn, being distributed around in the hay-mow, or on extemporary mattresses of straw on the thrashing-floor.

* Memoirs of Gatch, by Hon. John McLean, LL.D., page 108.

If the house where the services were held was not roomy enough to contain the congregation, the barn was sometimes fitted up for public worship; or, if the weather was good, the preacher would stand on the threshold and talk to the audience assembled within and the people crowding around the door-way without. Under such circumstances booths, or awnings consisting of the leafy branches of trees, were sometimes erected. This was a necessity, for most of the cabins were built in the open fields, every timber and shade tree being cut away, and no shelter from the sun-heat or winds left near them.

Fridays were always strictly observed as fast-days. Preaching began on Saturday morning at ten or eleven o'clock; in the afternoon a short service was held, after which Quarterly Conference was convened; and at night there was again preaching, or several prayer-meetings at different convenient points in the neighborhood. On Sunday morning the love-feast was held, conducted by one of the preachers; and about eleven o'clock the principal sermon of the Quarterly Meeting was preached by the Presiding Elder, followed by a sermon, it might be, from one of the other preachers, and then perhaps by an exhortation. The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper were usually celebrated at the close of the morning services, but sometimes deferred till the afternoon. At night there was again preaching—generally followed by prayer-meeting, exhortations to repentance, collects for penitent seekers, and fervent hymns, not always sung according to the laws of musical art, but with a fervor that almost carried the soul to the gates of Paradise.

Often, on such occasions, and especially at the camp-meetings, the converts would be numbered by the score. The meeting, protracted for several days, frequently resulted in numerous accessions to the Church, and the new members were watched over with a godly jealousy. Rarely would a Quarterly Meeting occasion pass by without the mourners' bench—an observance in those days almost peculiar to the Methodists, but now adopted by more than one religious sect which then looked upon it with ridicule or disfavor—and for weeks these occasions were looked to by the faithful with longing hopes and ardent prayers for the salvation of their families and their neighbors.

Such were the customs of our fathers when Methodism

enrolled its first converts and formed its first societies in this western country. Very little money was then in circulation, and but small sums could be collected for the support of the ministry. For this reason the prejudices of the Church against married preachers were exceedingly great. The laity looked upon the wife of an itinerant as an actual incumbrance to him and a burden to them. Nor is it much to be wondered at, that, when the total allowance for a preacher was scarcely a hundred dollars, and a deficiency amounting to more than one half was no unusual thing, the additional expense of a preacher's wife was a matter of complaint. If, in the face of all these discouragements, a preacher followed the leadings of Providence and the demands of nature, and married a wife, the people threw many obstacles in his way for a successful ministration. They said, You ought to locate; we cannot support you; and as a man's first social duty is to provide for his own, many preachers were compelled to relinquish the ministry for secular employments. Hence so many names were annually reported at Conference in answer to the question, "Who are under a location through family concerns?"

But the scarcity of money, and the consequent penuriousness of the pioneer Methodists, did not detract from their piety. They were strict observers of the Sabbath, and refrained with diligence from many customs which have since crept into vogue. Shaving, brushing clothes, polishing boots and shoes, and laying out the garments to be worn the next day, were all attended to on Saturday evening. Very little cooking was done: in many families none further than the making of coffee for breakfast, and of tea, where milk was not used instead, for supper.

No meal was eaten without the asking of a blessing or the returning of thanks. If the head of the household was absent, his wife took his place. The family always stood on their feet surrounding the table until this was done. Instead of a grace offered at the commencement of a meal a stanza was occasionally sung, and thanks given at the conclusion. Bishop Asbury thus used this verse:

Be present at our table, Lord;
Be here and every-where adored;
These creatures bless, and grant that we
May feast in paradise with thee.

If any other minister was present the Bishop would call upon him to return thanks when all had finished eating.

Family devotions were attended to night and morning. The entire household, including servants, were expected to be present and join in the services, which consisted of reading the Scriptures, singing a hymn, and offering prayer. Private devotion was rarely neglected. On entering the place of preaching a silent prayer was uttered, the head bowed down and the face covered—a form still often witnessed. The Psalmist's rule was strictly followed: "Evening, and morning, and at noon will I pray;" and the early Methodist memoris are full of the accounts of conversions at private prayer in the woods, in the fields, at the barn, or in the bedchamber. The case of Dr. Thomas Hinde, of Kentucky, was by no means peculiar. Says Bishop Kavanaugh:

On the place which he cultivated you might often see little houses built of sticks of wood, and covered most usually with bark, with a door for entrance. His grandchildren, myself among the number, who were accustomed to joyous gambols over his grounds, were rather perplexed as to the use of these singular structures. At length the old doctor was overheard at his private prayers in one of these houses. After that we all called them "Grandpa's prayer-houses." He aimed to conceal his person, but did not pray very silently—he could often be heard a considerable distance.*

The deprivations suffered by the pioneer settlers were shared to the full by the pioneer preachers. Their salary (over and above house rent and table and incidental expenses) was fixed at \$64 a year, afterward increased to \$80, and finally to \$100, at which rate it remained until the General Conference of 1856, when all reference to a fixed allowance was stricken from our Discipline. Surely, not from love of gain or emolument have our preachers entered the ministry. At no time within the history of our Church could the worldly advantage have been any temptation; and nothing but the impulsive power of the Holy Ghost could have ever induced the preacher of the Gospel to undergo the toils and the privations of an itinerant life. A paper in the handwriting of Bishop M^cKendree, now in the possession of the writer, shows the following account of receipts and expenditures in the year 1808: from seven Conferences

* Redford's "History of Methodism in Kentucky," vol. i, p. 378.

the receipts were \$175; salary, \$80; traveling and other expenses, \$61 63; leaving \$33 27, which the good Bishop is particular in noting to be yet due to the Conference. Think of a yearly salary of \$80 a year for a Bishop, and less than \$62 for his table expenses, traveling, and cost of keeping a horse!

Almost at the beginning of our Church the Conference raised a fund for the support of its superannuated members, and to make up deficiencies in the salary of those in the regular work; but even this small pittance was charily bestowed, and only upon the extremely necessitous cases. In the Minutes of the old Western Conference for 1803 is this entry:

Benjamin Lakin's Account, [of deficiency in his salary,] \$28 95. But it appears that the circuit maintained Brother Lakin's wife and her beast gratis; it is therefore our opinion that it is ungenerous in him to bring a demand on Conference; and seeing that there are others more needy, it is our judgment that he ought not to have any thing. *Jesse Walker's Account*, \$165 37. But it appears that \$76 of this is for children. It is our judgment that the demand for children be deducted, and then he is deficient \$89 37.

When David wrote "Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them," his prophetic soul surely saw not these days.

Few of us know from experience the deprivations of that heroic age. Our preachers have always been, as the late President Harrison characterized them,

A body of men who, for zeal and fidelity in the discharge of the duties they undertake, are not exceeded by any others in the whole world. I have been a witness of their conduct in the Western country for nearly forty years. They are men whom no labor tires, no scenes disgust, no danger frightens in the discharge of their duty. To gain recruits for the Master's service they sedulously seek out the victims of vice in the abodes of misery and wretchedness. Their stipulated pay is barely sufficient to perform the service assigned them. If, within the period I have named, a traveler on the Western frontiers had met a stranger in some obscure way, or assiduously urging his course through the intricacies of a tangled forest, his appearance staid and sober, and his countenance indicating that he was in search of some object in which his feelings were deeply interested—his apparel plain but entirely neat, and his little baggage adjusted with peculiar compactness—he might be almost certain that stranger was a Methodist preacher hurrying on to perform his daily task of preaching to separate and distinct congregations: and should the same traveler upon approaching some solitary, unfurnished, and scarcely habit-

able cabin hear the praises of God chanted with peculiar melody, or the doctrines of the Saviour urged upon the attention of some six or eight individuals with the same energy and zeal that he had seen displayed in addresses to a crowded audience of a populous city, he might be certain, without inquiry, that it was the voice of a Methodist preacher.

Nor did our pioneer fathers in the ministry shun exposure or hardships when they lay in the path of duty. They were forced to ride to their appointments in all kinds of weather: in heat and cold, in drought and wet, in snow and sleet; to swim rivers and creeks swollen with rain or filled with floating ice, no house or fire at hand where to change or dry their wet and freezing garments; laboring often under a burning fever or shaking with the tertian ague; sometimes so feeble that they could scarcely sit upon their beasts or stand on their feet during the time of their preaching; and yet, cold, hungry, and wet, they would often ride fifteen or twenty miles to an appointment, and in that condition preach, then without rest or refreshment proceed several miles farther and preach again, and, to crown all, perhaps be compelled to sleep in a dirty cabin or a damp bed. Brave men! Abundant in labors, inured to poverty and toil, suffering from the inclemencies of the seasons, daring hardships that few for love of gain would ever attempt, the story of their lives reads like a romance, and even fiction cannot surpass it. Deep and broad they laid the foundations. They wrought well, and we have entered into their labors. All honor be to their names!

It is a mistake to suppose that our preachers, as a class, have been ignorant men. That they were unlettered men, without the advantages of scholastic training, and but little read in general literature, is readily admitted; but that they have not kept abreast, or rather in advance, of the times is denied. The pioneers of the Church had few books and but little time for study; but what they had they knew by heart. The Bible, the Methodist Hymn-book, and the Church Discipline, constituted of many the entire library; out of these they learned their theology, and they learned it well. Many of these unlettered preachers were able to confound doctors of divinity; in the art of reasoning they were masters; from Mr. Wesley, the acutest logician of his times, they acquired the art of compressing a battery-discharge into a single argument; and in

effective oratory they surpassed, if possible, even John the Baptist. Yet among these apparently uncultured preachers were many good scholars—men who read the Scriptures in their original tongues, and whose acquaintance with the world's best thoughts was not meager.

The results of their labors cannot be computed in numbers. By them public opinion has been powerfully influenced; the spiritual life of members in every branch of the Church has been quickened; by their peculiar style of preaching the intelligence of the masses has been greatly increased; and thousands have been reclaimed to a new and better life through their efforts. Nor is it too much to say that our well-braced form of society, the wonderful progress of the world's intellect, the rapid advance of the laboring classes toward independence, the stirring activities of Christian benevolence, and the ripening Christian graces of every evangelical sect, are in no small degree due to Methodist preaching and Methodist theology. But what of the future? Under God's blessing, "to-morrow shall be as this day, *and much more abundant.*"

ART. IV.—VICARIOUS ATONEMENT.

ALL other questions of theology sink out of sight in comparison with the doctrine of the person and work of Christ. While, however, we see in this age concessions of the most grateful kind made to the person of Jesus, we cannot but view with some alarm the growing tendency to mistake and to undervalue his work. It is assumed that the incarnation of the Son of God is the highest point, the most important fact, of his history, and that his death is but the natural and consistent close of his earthly career; whereas, important as is the fact of his incarnation, it is to be regarded as deriving its significance from his death as its great end, as the wondrous consummation toward which it pointed for the accomplishment of the purpose for which the Son of God was made flesh. (Heb. ii, 14; John xii, 23-33; xviii, 37.) Not till as he was dying did Jesus say, "It is finished." Consequently, the correct understanding of the work of Jesus, as completed and accom-

plished in his passion and death, is important not only because of its intrinsic worth as being the true means of a sinner's approach to God, but also because of its relation to all the doctrines of Christianity as constituting one whole and perfect system. The interpretation put upon the atonement of Jesus gives complexion to every other question of the Christian religion: sound, decided views here almost invariably imply the same views on other points; and loose, vacillating opinions here, correspondingly vague opinions elsewhere. As the hearty reception of Christ in his mission carries with it the whole train of personal righteousness, so the *rational* reception of Christ in his mission seems to carry along with it an entire consequence of sound doctrine. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." This is the doctrine of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

The history of Jesus must strike every reader, even the most superficial, as unique. If it could be read with no previously formed opinion of its cause, it would yet impress one by its separateness from the lives of ordinary mortals. Though closely, profoundly, one with men, he still was removed from them, walking in a new path, filling a plane of thought, feeling, and action wholly his own, and actually unapproached and unapproachable. And the feature which first and most forcibly seizes the attention is not his wisdom, his purity, his power, or even his goodness, but his *sorrowfulness*. Though human among the human, mingling alike in the amenities of the wedding and in the mournful ceremonials of the grave; though going about doing good, and so busying himself with actual life; though acceding to all its lawful claims of family, society, government; yet there is an abstractedness, a depth, a pensiveness in his eye, which indicate an unusual insight to human nature; and this insight, with its necessary conviction, seems to reflect itself upon his features, and, indeed, to invest his whole manner with an air of painfulness, which led inspiration to characterize him as "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." And then what is most wonderful is, the second thought which arises—that this man, who for his purity, his power, his wisdom and goodness, had the best, the only right to real happiness, uniform and continuous, is the only man whose life was uniformly sorrowful; a life, singularly enough,

deepening in the shadows of grief as it deepened in the light of holiness. The first glimpse of his intelligent career is seen in the disturbance between his own and his earthly parents' will, which doubtless must have cost him a struggle, as it did his mother; the last glimpses, the awful conflict and perplexities of Gethsemane and Calvary, where his own will bows in deepest submission to the heavenly Father's will.

The inquiry, then, forces itself upon us, What is the meaning of this phenomenon, standing thus alone in the history of mankind? Why was Jesus—the spotless, sinless Jesus—such a sufferer? He did not deserve to suffer, he did not need to suffer. What is the key which unlocks the mystery of his incarnation, his passion, and death? I answer, His life was spent for others. His sufferings and death were vicarious, were in the room of others. He, the innocent, holy Jesus, suffered and died for guilty man, to atone for him, to save him, who otherwise for his sinfulness must have died for ever. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: . . . the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. . . . For the transgression of my people was he stricken." "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

But the question further arises, What was the *character* of Christ's sufferings? They were vicarious; but in what sense? Hitherto there was but one sense in theology in which they could be vicarious, but Dr. Bushnell, with his accustomed conceit of originality, affects to use the term in other than its fixed theological meaning. Any thing done in the room of another is vicarious; suffering endured in the effort to save another is vicarious; and so Christ's sufferings, because of this primal, literal definition of the word, were *vicarious*, even though they were in no sense expiatory. Thus he gives us a book under the misnomer of "Vicarious Sacrifice," when, according to customary theological language, it is in his opinion no vicarious sacrifice which Christ offered. The misnomer, at the very door-way of the new temple which he has attempted to rear, is but a sample of the contradictions and bad taste which are displayed in all its parts.

But waiving terms which cannot affect the inquiry, all who admit the efficacy of Christ's sufferings and death do allow

that in some important sense they changed the relation existing between God and man; were designed to bring about, and did produce, a most beneficial effect upon man's moral condition. To determine the sense of this change, to show how this beneficial effect was produced, is the vital issue.

With those of the purely rationalistic school, who reject an atonement altogether—who claim that Jesus was simply an eminent or pre-eminent Helper of humanity—I do not propose to deal. They are at least consistent in their course. Rejecting an atonement as impossible in nature and abhorrent to their moral sentiments, they cut out and turn over to the flames all Scriptures which teach it. These Scriptures cannot be true, or they belong to a barbarous age, because they teach what the moral judgment knows to be false and cruel.

The great point of divergence with those who hold to an atonement is found in these differences: 1. That it affected wholly and simply man's condition: 2. That it affected both God's and man's condition. Here the separation begins, and diverse opinions, taking thence their rise, as *opinions* never meet. It is to be hoped that those who propound and hold them, in consideration of the uncertainty and difficulty of metaphysical theology, may meet before their theories, or otherwise must they be doomed to a hopeless alienation. Both of these theories ground themselves, according to the judgments of those who expound them, in the nature of God and in the necessities of man.

1. The first assumes that, while man is sinful and morally unable to recover himself to holiness, it was of the nature of God, of his own free motion, without regard to any thing due himself, to provide for man's recovery by all means possible.

This general view is variously expressed; but it is a fair generalization of all those views which maintain exclusively the manward notion of the atonement. The statement is varied, according as the several adherents hold more or less firmly to the idea of an atonement.

"Mr. Jowett thinks 'Christ performed the greatest moral act that was ever done in this world.'"—*Rigg, Anglican Theology*, p. 322. Mr. Maurice's fundamental principle is, that Christ's life and death were the divine sacrifice by means of which God declared his own relation as a loving, reconciled

Father to universal mankind. As the God-man, Christ embodied and exhibited self-sacrificing love to man and God; thus representing God to man; and at the same time, as the archetypal man, attracting men to imitate God as seen and known in his humanity, and glorifying the principle of self-sacrifice as due from man to the God-man.—*Ibid.*, p. 344.

Dr. Ellis, in his "Half-Century of the Unitarian Controversy," says:

Unitarianism maintains that the death of Christ, so far as its efficacy is distinctly defined, is instrumental to our salvation through its influence on the life and heart of man, not through its vicarious value with God; and also, that revelation does not acquaint us with any obstacle in the method of administration which God has established as his government which prevents his exercising mercy to the penitent, except through the substitution of a victim to law.—Page 193.

He says further:

We protest against the charge of confining our construction of the atoning death of Christ to the power and service of example; we repel it. It is not our doctrine that the death of Christ becomes efficacious to us as an example, or even that it is especially needed or available in that direction. Christ to us is a victim, a sacrifice; his death was a sacrificial death. Its method and purpose and influence fix a new, a specific, a peculiar, an eminent meaning to the word sacrifice, when used of him. But, in conformity with that deciding distinction already made as settled by the terms of a God-ward or a man-ward intent in the cross, we regard Jesus as a sacrifice *for man*; but not a sacrifice *to God*. The difference is an infinite one. . . . We regard Christ as a victim offered by human sin for human redemption. He was nailed to the cross to secure our salvation, but not to make reparation for our sins to God.—Pp. 193, 194.

Dr. Bushnell says:

Christ is here, according to the doctrine of this treatise, to be the moral power of God on the world, so the moral power of God unto salvation. We have seen him, for example, fulfilling the love-principle in vicarious suffering for us; revealing, in his obedience, God's everlasting obedience to law; adding vigor to law by his tremendous enforcements; doing honor to God's retributive justice by subjecting himself to all the corporate evils it brings on the human state; and by all these methods declaring so impressively the righteousness of God as to prepare the glorious possibility and fact of a free justification.*

* "Vicarious Atonement," p. 528.

I give also a passage from the voluminous work on the Atonement, by J. M'Leod Campbell :

The peace-speaking power of the blood of Christ is to be conceived of as a direct power on the spirit in its personal relation to the Father of spirits, revealing at once the heart of the Father, and the way into the heart of the Father, even the Son. The blood that reveals this imparts peace, makes perfect as pertains to the conscience—yea, purges it from dead works to serve the living God. Indeed, that the relation of that blood to God's law, and the honor it rendered to that law, have had, as we have seen, a direct reference to our receiving the adoption of sons, implies that it has not come directly between man and judgment, or taken him, by the fact of its being shed, from beneath the righteous rule of God, and, therefore, that it ministers no peace, being rejected ; but, on the contrary, only a fearful looking for of judgment, so assuredly giving no place for the direct confidence, "He suffered," therefore I shall not suffer.—Page 214.

I need hardly state the objections to Mr. Jowett's view. It is so far removed as to be scarcely dangerous. But little reverence is left in him for the holy Scriptures, and he brushes them aside at his pleasure and sets up his own "ideas." To say that Christ performed the greatest moral act that was ever done in the world, is not to say much, and does not imply any very especial, much less an exhaustive, power in his sufferings and death to effect human salvation. Mr. Maurice, with more of reverence left for the word of God, affects to confine himself to its authority, and so seeks by its teachings to explain the work of Christ, but reduces that work almost wholly to a moral exhibition. It is the expression of God's love working in the God-man, who, as the archetypal man, draws, or is to draw, all mankind into his own likeness of self-denying love. God in Christ speaks nothing of holiness, authority, wrath against sin. Dr. Ellis, representing the most conservative phase of New England Unitarianism, disclaims entirely all God-ward effect in the atonement ; that its influence on man is not by any vicarious value with God ; that it does not show or remove any obstacle in the government of God to the free pardon of the penitent sinner. It is without a substitution offered to violated law. Although repudiating the charge that his school look upon Christ merely as an example, or chiefly so, yet I cannot see that his definition of Christ as a sacrifice for sin is any thing more than Christ's succumbing to the oppositions of sin as

the victim of its hate. He was not God's victim, but the shining, sinless Exemplar, the pre-eminent Holy One, whom the malice of sin could not allow to escape; and who, in falling beneath its power and witnessing thus to Truth and Duty, of right becomes in some mysterious sense the dispenser of life: in what other than the sense of moral attraction, as in the theory of Maurice, I am unable to see. I have already said Dr. Bushnell's vicarious sacrifice is a misnomer. A good trap it is to catch the unwary. I am sorry so honest and brave a man should descend to the least unfairness in so grand a matter as an effort on his part to help settle forever the vexed and difficult doctrine of the atonement. He disavows every peculiarity in the ordinary definition of the atonement of Christ as received by the orthodox Church, and still hides himself under its phraseology, and concludes his essay to wrest every old time-honored expression of the doctrine from its accepted use, by exhorting those who think with him, who may feel some compunctions in the use of the old nomenclature, not to mind—words are not much—to go on with the same symbols, even though they may not convey the secret, hidden sense in which they are held. No wonder that a man who begins by bandying English, Greek, Hebrew, about at his pleasure, twisting words to suit his argument, should end by declaring that it is not very important to use words exactly as we understand them. He finds another sort of justice in God, after God began to exist and created man, than that which previously existed as a conception, eternal and all embracing. God's justice could need no expiation; there can be no such thing as substitution; no such thing as suffering the punishment of the guilty on the part of the innocent. The love of God was always vicarious, and God suffered for the sin of the world from its first commission. Finally Jesus came forth from the Father to manifest this suffering: he met sin and conquered it by submitting to its inconveniences and triumphing over them, so showing the holiness of God's law in his loyalty to it under temptation, and the exceeding struggle it required in him to keep it. He pronounced awful curses upon those who should disobey it, and thus by his own obedience, and by his authority, declared the immutable righteousness of God: and so having endured all the discomforts and pains of seeking a lost world in a sinful surrounding,

and yet without himself becoming sinful, he has now become the author of salvation to all who believe in him—that is, receive his same spirit of righteous obedience. The holiness of God, the absolute demerit of guilt, the wrath of God against sin and sinners, has little or no place in Dr. Bushnell's attempt to explain the great problem, "How can man be just with his Maker."

Mr. Campbell wrestles with the problem manfully—his prolix volume on the atonement, and his less one on "Christ the Bread of Life," have in them some noble thoughts. Christ did expiate the sin of the world; but he did it by taking its sin so far as to have it condemned in his bodily nature, to confess it before God, and to offer intercessory prayer to the Father on the basis of his suffering and confession. All well: there is confession in suffering and words, there is intercession; but he falls short of the great fact of Christ himself offered for the sin of the world. The confession, the intercession—but where the victim? The key to the atonement Mr. Campbell finds in the passage, "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God." He does not understand by this that Christ obtains our sanctification by carrying out the eternal purpose of God in sending him forth a Lamb slain, etc., but in the perfect obedience to the divine moral law which he accomplished: and thenceforth as the Son of God in humanity, he is to save by working in the sinner the same conformity to the Divine will or law. Hence, in his "Bread of Life" he objects to the communicant's looking to Christ's righteousness as a *work done for* him, and so to be realized, but insists that faith must apprehend Christ's righteousness as the spirit of obedience or holiness working *in* the believer.

(2.) All these views fall short of what I deem the truly adequate statement of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Stated fully and briefly, it may be affirmed that man was unable to save himself, being guilty and corrupt before God and condemned to death; that God of his own free love provided for his recovery, but not without answering a demand on his own nature and government, which required a full *satisfaction* for man's sin; this satisfaction was made by the offering of Christ, the only begotten Son of God—the God-man who by his obedience, passion, and death, became an expiatory sacrifice to God for the sins of this whole world.

This satisfaction was due primarily to the justice of God, which held the transgressor guilty, and amenable to penalty or punishment, and consequently could not allow of his forgiveness without violence to the nature and government of God. Either the sinner must die, or some one every way fit to be his substitute must die in his place. This substitute the Son of God was suited to be; he as very God and author of law, and therefore the equal of the law, could become such substitute, and so by rendering an adequate sacrifice to the law maintain its integrity and his own justice. The infinite Son of God was not without means consistently to accomplish this purpose. He became incarnate without becoming sinful; he came under law while he was above law; he obeyed law, allowed all its claims, suffered the oppositions of sin, the pains of sin, not as any innocent, sensitive spirit could suffer them, but suffered, feeling all the time that he was taking in his own heart the anger of God which was rightly due the guilty race with whom and for whom, and, after a certain sense, in whom, he was living and acting. A voluntary substitute—moved to be such by his own and the Father's free and united love—he spared himself in nothing, but “made himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.” He was made sin—I shrink not from it; no nice, soft, syllabub explanations will do—he was made sin, counted as sinful and punished, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. “The wages of sin is death.” “He was made a curse for us.” The satisfaction thus rendered to the justice of God by no means exhausts the full conception of the atonement. Ascended to the Father, by the power which inhered in him to lay down his own life and to take it up again—by reason of the perfect satisfaction thus made once in time—he obtained gifts for men. The grace hitherto restrained from a guilty world now streamed out afresh in superabundance by the power of the Holy Ghost or Spirit of Christ shed forth. Thus the atonement of Christ, as correctly understood, includes all that is implied in a perfect revelation of truth in the teachings and spirit of Jesus; all meant by a perfect manifestation of love in the gift of the Father's only-begotten Son, and in the self-sacrificing surrender of Christ himself; all meant by a perfect exhibition of holiness, tenderness, in the

sinless purity, obedience, and affectionateness of Jesus; all that is meant by his being the power of God in the soul of man. And also it possess and presents to the guilty, despairing sinner, set forth for his free and instantaneous forgiveness, an expiation which makes his peace with God, the Eternal Sovereign and Father of spirits. But this doctrine of substitutional satisfaction to the justice of God is a rock on which many split. It is an offense. I may notice a few of the leading objections offered to its acceptance.

1. It is asserted that this so-called justice of God is a "moral fiction," a creature of man's own fancy, and has no real existence in God. 'God moves freely as he will without regard to anything in himself which can hinder him, or any thing which needs propitiation in order for him to do as he will.' But if it is a fiction in God which demands of him that he must punish the guilty, how will we explain the universal sentiment of justice among men which feels and says the guilty should and must be punished. The execration pronounced against crime as deserving penalty, and which will not allow the exercise of mercy at its own option, is a stern reality. If it be said, Men feel differently upon sober second thought, I say, Not always; and I say that when they do relax, it is frequently attributable to an indisposition to take the trouble which the enforcement of law requires. It is a pity that Mr. Jowett and Mr. Maurice can descant so elegantly on the divine inspiration of humanity, exalt its ideas, etc., quite to a revelation, and yet can see only a fiction in that justice of God which demands either the guilty's punishment or an expiation, when the same principle pervades all mankind. It is a pity, too, that Dr. Bushnell can appeal so constantly to the moral sentiments for his guidance, and can see only fictitious representation when, in explaining God's feeling toward guilt, it is claimed that its exact image is in man's own breast. When he would evade this justice of God, he can find a great moral law of right which was before God himself, before *instituted* law, and consequently before penalty. This great law to which he refers the conduct of God before he was hampered by justice, a mere institute, he finds recognized in the soul. And so he does, only not his use of it.

But why should he be so oblivious to this sense of indigna-

tion against sin, its accountability to judgment and wrath? Evidently it does not suit his scheme of *Moral Galvanism* to see it. It raises a barrier to the unrestrained, free-moving mercy of which he delights to think.

He asks, Why talk of the satisfaction of God's justice? Why not also speak of the satisfaction of his mercy? Must not God be merciful as well as just? Cannot we as well conceive of justice relaxing as of mercy relaxing her exercise? God knows when to enforce justice and when to restrain it; and he can do either as he pleases without the intervention of an expiation to appease him, etc. This is essentially the argument of the whole school who hold simply to the "moral" theory of the atonement.

It is conceded that the necessity for propitiation arises out of the separation produced by sin between God and man. Therefore reconciliation concerns both God and man. Where there is cause of separation, certainly both parties are related to the cause, and the removal of the cause must affect the attitude of each. It cannot be that all, in effecting a reconciliation, is due to one, and that the offending party. The first instinct of nature demands that satisfaction be made to the offended party. The love of God as an active, living principle has certainly been stayed by sin—we see and know this every day—so that while disposed to move it hovers around his rectitude and holiness unable to move. God's love is a *holy* love, and can move only as it moves righteously. Otherwise it deteriorates into weakness under the guise of compassion, and into cruelty under the guise of mercy. The very fact that God is love makes him all the more angry with sin, and incapable of the least seeming countenance of it, for it is the great destroyer of the creatures of his love. So that "the expression, the *wrath of God*, simply embodies the truth that the relations of God's love to the world are unsatisfied, unfulfilled." *

"It is an appropriate description of the love of God, the divine pathos restrained by his righteousness! Indeed, the very existence of mercy could not be conceived without conceiving of the justice of God; much less could its exercise be conceived without a divine judgment against sin. Where is any need of mercy, until the justice of God, enforcing the de-

* Martenson, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 303.

mands of holy love, holds the sinner to a strict accountability, claiming in its inexorable rightness, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Now this is what God, true to his own nature, to his eternal love, does: he provides a ransom, a substitute, for the guilty and condemned, which satisfies righteous judgment and frees the guilty sinner. Thus we get our first notion of compassion. Mercy does not override justice to release the sinner in the face of outraged law, but exerts herself to produce a ransom, and so herself proclaims that God can now "be just, and a justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." The infinite, supreme love of God claims, in the conscience of the sinner, a debt which he cannot pay, and for which there is no resource except in Infinite Love itself, and so mercy springs from the bosom of Eternal Love. Is God then in conflict with himself? Nay, by this course his unchangeableness is demonstrated. "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed."

How can we do otherwise than to judge of God's character as it is manifested to us in his dealings with men as a *righteous governor*, following the laws his own finger has written upon the tables of the conscience as well as on tables of stone? We don't see him deal with us, as a person with persons, wholly or chiefly, but as a ruler with subjects. Government is of God. Its laws are his laws as mankind have been able to interpret them. Mankind could not appreciate a divine government which based forgiveness simply upon the repentance of the sinner without any satisfaction to the sanctity and integrity of Law. They see that the repentance of the guilty cannot always undo the damage done by transgression. They do not see that the original and main intent of law is not to reform the bad, but rather to protect the good. They do see that its design toward the wicked is not to reform them, but to deter them from crime; and that it has power to reform only as it has power to deter. Here is one of those glaring inconsistencies so common in Dr. B.'s book. He makes Christ republish, if not originally promulge, the doctrine of future eternal punishment—using the arguments ordinarily employed; and yet he presents Christ, in his great work of atonement, as evading the penalty due to the justice of God for sin. God does pardon all sinners without a satisfaction for guilt—his

love demands it and his mercy overrides his justice, and yet, O yet! he can see millions upon millions writhing in everlasting torments, and the mercy of God can do nothing to relieve them! If mercy could once overleap justice, why not twice, thrice, always? I cannot refrain from Mr Arthur's words in the "Tongue of Fire," "Right in our governments is the imperfect reflection of a perfect right. Had the favor of the Almighty crossed the line which divides innocence from guilt, and smiled upon the latter, that smile would have been a scathing flash, wherein all morals would have blackened."—P. 18.

2. It is further objected that substitutional satisfaction shocks our *moral sense*.

"That God, an infinitely good being, perfect in all his ways, should require a satisfaction before he can pardon the sinner, degrades him in our judgment of his character—it is what we would not think of any good man." As previously stated, we must judge of God by the facts of his government, supposing that government to be a transcript of himself. It is no shock to our moral sense that God must maintain his justice—that he cannot forgive without a sacrifice to it when he himself provides the sacrifice. He will neither allow justice nor the sinner to be sacrificed, but maintains the one and saves the other. This process with himself and before men he prefers.

It is thought especially derogatory that he should require and accept as a satisfaction the sufferings of an innocent being, and so should be unjust to innocence under the plea of faithfulness to justice.

Bishop Butler has unanswerably met this general objection in his "Analogy." "When, in the daily course of natural providence, it is appointed that innocent people should suffer for the faults of the guilty, this is liable to the same objection as the instance we are now considering."—P. 188. But I am surprised that Dr. Bushnell, while admitting the righteousness of this principle so long as suffering is simply endurance to recover the lost—the pain and anguish through which self-sacrificing love can alone reach and rescue the sinful—shrinks back, as from a horrible thing, from the admission that this suffering of innocent, self-sacrificing love, may be, must be, primarily an expiation for guilt.

Now I submit that it is as reconcilable with the character

of God that he cannot clear the guilty without the suffering of innocence as a satisfaction to justice as that he cannot save the sinner at all without the intervention of suffering innocence. Does Dr. B. and those who with him magnify the efficacy of the mere moral aspect of Christ's sufferings allow that the sinner could have been saved without these sufferings? Were they simply adopted as the best, and not the only, expedient? How could a just, a holy, a good God on *any principle* require the suffering of innocence for guiltiness? and if on any principle, why not as well on the principle of a satisfaction to justice as upon any other? We do see the innocent suffering for the guilty, where the only apparent, and indeed possible, result is punishment for sin. He is shocked that Christ, the innocent holy One, should be punished to satisfy justice; and yet he can exult in the exhibition of his indescribable pain and agony in suffering to show the holiness of the law, the pain of transgression, the infamy of sin. This innocent Jesus may endure all the pains to which sin can expose him by snapping at him as a fierce fiend on his highway of obedience, tear him to pieces, crush his guileless spirit, but it must not be thought that any of this suffering is at all expiatory—that would make God cruel. It would make him commit the absurdity of thinking that in punishing an innocent person he really punished a guilty one, the only proper object of his wrath. But we do see in the course of providence a constant transfer of suffering from the guilty to the innocent, where it can be only regarded as penalty, and never becomes to the innocent in any sense disciplinary. A guilty mother destroys her innocent child, simply because it is a child of guilty lust; what can such destruction be regarded other than a punishment of the parent upon the child, and that without possibility of discipline to the child? We do find as a fact the course of justice stayed by innocent suffering, so that the ends of administration are practically met, although we cannot always know how the transfer of punishment takes place, or whether it always takes place justly.

3. The objection is further raised: If Christ expiated the sins of the whole world, how can God be just and afterward punish the sin of the incorrigible transgressor? Can he require justice to be *twice* satisfied?

I will not take refuge under the distinction of a "public" and a "distributive" justice, and say it was to satisfy the former and not the latter that Jesus died. "The punishment due to individual transgression remains unatoned for, and, therefore, where he pardons it is an act of free grace; none can claim pardon as an act of justice, and so sinners punished for their sins are punished only for what they could not be forgiven, except as an act of grace." It may be readily seen how election and reprobation may hide under such subtlety. Christ did suffer to satisfy justice in the most *absolute* sense, in all its aspects and in all its claims; but he did so in his relation to the human family as its Head, as the second Adam; and in that capacity, not only as the second Adam in a human nature, but as the Lord from glory, the God-man. The human race cannot be regarded as a heap of sand without necessary cohesion; it cannot be regarded as detached parts in its individual members without essential connection. It is one. It is a body with unity of life. Its emblem is not in the broken, severed branches, and fallen, scattered leaves, of the tree, but in the living tree with all its branches, twigs, leaves, growing upon and deriving sustenance and life from the one trunk. Christ is related to humanity not as one branch to another branch, nor as one leaf to another leaf, but as the trunk which sustains all is to all. Coming and existing thus in our humanity, what he does in it he necessarily does for it, and for it all, in every member of it. It is conjectured that if we had an instrument sufficiently powerful, we might see in every seed the full outline of the matured plant which is subsequently to grow out of it. Now in some such way Christ, the great germinal seed of humanity, has in him all the possibilities of the whole race. When it is accepted that all Adam's posterity sinned in his sin, no such doctrine is received as that Adam committed every actual transgression of every one of his descendants. It is not necessary to conclude that his consciousness took cognizance of any such fact; and yet it is believed that his sin by *possibility*, growing out of his federal headship, contained germinally every sin which his fallen children have committed. So, is it not equally fair to say that when we affirm that Christ was punished for the sins of the whole world, we mean not to imply that it was necessary that in enduring the penalty he should have felt

the suffering which divine anger inflicts upon every sinning soul? He endured that suffering *potentially*, as the second Adam and the Restorer of the race.—The curse due mankind fell upon Him *extensively*, but not *intensively*. As all the world sinned and died in the first Adam, so all the world was punished and made alive in the second Adam. "For we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead," that is, then did all die in him, or were punished in him; "that they who live," they who are so made alive by suffering in him the demerit due their sin, "should henceforth live not unto themselves," etc. It is not necessary, therefore, to assume that they who are punished for actual transgression are punished a second time, and that justice is twice expiated.

Moreover, it is manifest that Christ by his wondrous intervention to save mankind becomes to the race the author of a new life. And standing thus to the race as the Lord of life from heaven, and the Saviour of humanity, he possesses the right to introduce for the race a new law of life. What shall it be? What can it be, other than the law of *faith* in him as the Redeemer of the world? Jesus could not do otherwise than place mankind under a law of obedience, which was necessary to secure to them the benefit of his atonement. As the atonement itself was necessary, because God must deal with man as a moral agent, so its intervention cannot be supposed to supersede this necessity. Since to have failed to vindicate the high principles of righteousness in the act of redemption would have been to ignore man's moral nature, so also to have constituted an atonement satisfying these principles, but disregarding man's free choice in embracing it, would have been equally to have trodden out his moral nature and rendered his salvation not a religious one, because destitute of the virtue which can only be predicated of freedom. Hence it appears, as might be anticipated, the all-containing sin, the sin of sins, under the new life, is unbelief, the willful rejection of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "Of sin, because they believe not on me." And this is the sin for which the persistent transgressor is punished.

The relation thus introduced by faith between Christ and the soul comprises the new law of life in Christ Jesus. The guilty but penitent sinner now sees his sin expiated in the death or

Jesus, accepts the substitution, and this faith or acceptance of Christ is counted to him for righteousness. God is just, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus. I would not prefer to say with Dr. Bushnell, (as I neither like his freedom with the Queen's English nor the purpose he seeks,) the "*rightouser*" of him that believeth!

The fault which the whole school of the deniers of expiation find with this view is, that it fills the mind with the notion of a merely legal justification instead of a moral righteousness. This whole school would regard the work of Christ as strictly subjective—a work to be accomplished in us by the operation of the Spirit of Christ in producing his own image in our nature. Now the beauty of the old doctrine is, that it is both objective and subjective. As a legal justification, it first removes the barrier to the free movement of the Spirit of Christ into the heart of the penitent, and then consentaneously fills him with righteousness of nature. Christ is made the power of God unto salvation as the ground of pardon in his satisfying merits, and he is made the power of God in the soul by the inworking of the Holy Ghost, answering to the atoning blood, which renews and seals the child of God. Now, I do affirm that this doctrine meets the whole case, and that no other does. The first want of a burdened, condemned, despairing, but penitent sinner, is *pardon*. Hence the cry, "Have mercy upon me!" from the lips of David; "God be merciful to me, a sinner!" from the publican. The mind is occupied, not with its corruption, but with its guilt and danger. It would have, first of all, instantaneously—now—the wrath of God removed. The more you offer a guilty, despairing sinner a holy Saviour simply to work in him, the more, it seems to me, you are liable to discourage him; but when once forgiven, and he has tasted that the Lord is gracious, then, enamored of the beauty of holiness, his heart sweetly submits to the informing, sanctifying power of the divine character and Spirit. I am amazed that Dr. Bushnell, in his chapter on "Christ the Power of God," should plead as though those who hold to the doctrine of Christ's sufferings as a ground of justification have underrated the inward work of Christ's Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, as an integral and inseparable part of the work of justification. Such teaching cannot be found in our orthodox standards, nor from our living preachers. As Wesleyans we

can only smile at such ignorant assumption. On the theory that Christ's work is wholly an inward, spiritual one—setting aside the original pardon, which was needed when the penitent soul first came to God—what becomes not only of the remaining corruption, but of the repeated transgression of the imperfect believer? Where is the expiation to take away, or cover, or secure forgiveness for this recurring, constant guilt? What could poor human nature do, even at its best, when gazing upon the perfect righteousness of Christ, and even when conscious of the inworking grace of his Spirit in carrying forward the work of holiness, if it could not cling in its seasons of error and failure and transgression to the merits of Christ, as indicating a work done *for* it, to be imputed to, or be passed over to it, by the simple act of faith? Indeed, take away this blessed thought and fact, “for Christ's sake,” and you eviscerate our whole body of divinity. The Old Testament types are no longer types, and are without significance; the New Testament sacrifice is but one of the moral sacrifices of the great and good; the songs of ages lose their sweetest notes, their divinest harmony; preaching becomes but the instrument of a moral improvement, and the glad evangel sounding along the march of the centuries, “Free grace, sovereign grace, for all despairing souls,” is hushed forever. Dr. Bushnell's most charitable explanation of the happy fruits of the old doctrine in the myriads of believers who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb is, that their experience was better than their theology! But, somehow, the acute and eloquent Martineau, though a Unitarian, finds among those who cleave to the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus all the philosophy, all the poetry, all the society for which he most cares.

In testing doctrines by the Bible, the only and fully sufficient source of doctrine, the question is not what doctrine may find some proofs here and there in its teachings, but what doctrine will answer best to *all* its teachings? what is most distinctly taught by the analogy of Scripture? The older Rationalists of Germany conceded that no impartial reader could study the Scriptures without seeing that they taught the doctrine of expiatory piacular sacrifice; and hence, as I have said, they expurgated those parts which taught what was obnoxious to reason, and among them those that clearly taught vicarious

sacrifice. But it is left for our times to see men deny the most natural and time-honored meaning of the word of God in order to suit a theory. Those who must hold on to the whole Bible as the inspired mind of God, and who must give up the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, must, of course, begin by denying outright the typical character of Old Testament sacrifice. The whole Unitarian fraternity and Dr. Bushnell think that the ritual of the Old Testament was simply educational—for the time; it was the best adapted to school the world in its then barbarous condition, and it simply happened that New Testament writers found types of Christ and his sacrifice in what was never instituted by God or understood by God's people with any such intent. Accidents will happen. Isolated facts become precedents. History repeats itself. There is a God in history giving it a divine philosophy; but alas for any traceable mind of God in the religion which he himself gave to his own peculiar people! "These sacrifices, too, were only lustral, and as such are applied to the death of Christ. There was no expiation for guilt in them; they were only cleansing," etc.

Now I think it may be clearly shown that the fundamental thought of all religious sacrifice is expiation, atoning for guilt, a satisfaction to justice. Hear the verdict of the philosophic mind of Madame de Staël in her work on Germany:

I consider sacrifices as the basis of all religion, and the death (*sic*) of Abel as the first type of that sacrifice which forms the groundwork of Christianity. The greater part of ancient religions instituted human sacrifice; but in this barbarity there was something remarkable, namely, the necessity of a solemn expiation. Nothing in effect can obliterate from the soul the idea that there is a mysterious efficacy in the blood of the innocent, and that heaven and earth are moved by it. Men have always believed that the just could obtain, in this life or the other, the pardon of the guilty. There are some primitive ideas in the human species which re-appear, with more or less disfigurement, in all times and among all nations.

Coming directly to the subject of the Mosaic sacrifices, they show,

1. That the offerer presented the victim as his own representative; 2. That by laying his hands upon the head of the sacrifice he symbolically transferred to it his own guilt; 3. That in its death he exhibited the punishment due to his own sins; and,

4. That in the pouring or sprinkling of the blood before the Lord was concentrated the very point and meaning of the whole service, since the blood represented the life which had been forfeited, and which was thus symbolically rendered to the Lord.—*Rigg*, p. 370.

The peace-offering, the thank-offering, were based upon the reconciliation effected by the sin-offering. Kurtz says, "The animal and its sinless life stand instead of man; instead of him it suffers the punishment of death, thus making void the guilt imputed to it. This is a juridical view, because it looks upon the slaying of the beast as an act of punishment, and that which the beast effects by suffering for man as a vicarious sacrifice."

It is assumed that, because on two occasions in the Old Testament where an atonement was made and God's wrath was stopped there was no beast slain and no blood shed, therefore the slaying of the beast and the shedding of blood was not necessary to an atonement, and that the element of expiation did not enter into either the nature of the atonement or the sacrifice of the beast. When the people had sinned in the matter of the golden calf, Moses said, "Now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin." He went up accordingly, says Dr. Bushnell, and made intercession for them in words of supplication, without any sacrifice at all, and this was his atonement. The stopping of the plague by the zeal of Phinehas is cited by Mr. Campbell, in which it is affirmed an atonement was made by a moral act simply. It should be borne in mind that both Moses and Phinehas were acting under a system of sacrifices. That system is not to be judged by single or exceptional cases, but by its general tenor and direction. These cases were both extraordinary—the exigency was very great—and to meet the urgent demands of the crisis God accepted as an atonement the zeal of his servants, not as superseding, but as complementing the general law under which they acted. We do not know what Moses did on the Mount in making an atonement. To say he made no sacrifice is to assume too much. Evidently he offered to God what was more than the life of the beast, even his own life, in consideration of which *virtual* sacrifice the course of justice was stayed, the nation was spared, though, as a partial

punishment, that generation perished in the wilderness. That God had instituted a fixed method of sacrificial atonement by the blood of animals never was meant to exclude the possibility of atonement by the self-sacrificing zeal of his servants acting under and in harmony with this instituted method. The zeal of Phinehas made an atonement by the sacrifice of the blood of a guilty pair, and after twenty and four thousand had died of the plague. What further ritualistic atonement took place is not stated, and yet it may be inferred from the analogy of other cases that such an atonement was afterward made. The inspired historian might not have deemed it necessary to note what usually followed as a course of instituted law. But these passages have another side. The acts of Moses and of Phinehas are called atonements, and evidently so because they stopped the wrath of God. This is the main significance. There is no slain beast, no shed blood mentioned, it is true; but with what consistency can it be denied of an atonement by the shedding of blood that its fundamental object is not to stop the wrath of God, or, in other words, not to make an expiation for sin? If the turning away of God's anger is necessary to an atonement in the one case it is so in another. And here is one of those errors into which objectors to the doctrine of vicarious atonement so commonly fall: they take detached passages and build their theories upon them as isolated accounts, whereas the true method is to explain these separate instances by the whole scope of Scripture. We cannot take the words "atonement," "sacrifice," "reconciliation," "redemption," "mediation," etc., and insist upon the particular significance which any one of these words may have in a special connection as the basis of a sufficient definition of the work of Christ, but they must be studied in all their relations and applications, and thus the results of a fair and thorough comparison arrived at. That is the true meaning which best answers to all the varieties of meaning in the different and detached passages. There is scarcely a passage in the Old Testament where the word "atonement" does not imply the removal of wrath. When the people, after the punishment of the two hundred and fifty rebels, murmured against Moses and Aaron, and the Lord threatened to destroy them, Moses gave direction to Aaron: "Take a censer, and put fire therein from the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly to the con-

gregation, and make atonement for them: for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun." (Num. xvi, 46.) Here was no beast or blood, but the fire from the altar manifestly stood for the sacrifice which it usually consumed. In these three cases it is God's wrath excited by sin which is appeased by propitiation. The atonement (Greek, *εξιλασμός*, and the Hebrew, *כִּפּוּר*) certainly intervenes between God's wrath and sin. In the sacrifices of the day of atonement the same thought is clearly revealed. After Aaron had offered his bullock of the sin-offering, he was to take two kids of the goats for a sin-offering for the people, and, bringing the two goats to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to cast lots upon them—one lot for the Lord and the other lot for the scape-goat. The one which fell to the Lord was slain, its blood sprinkled upon the altar, as the blood of the bullock had been sprinkled for Aaron, after which he was to bring the live goat: and lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and sending him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. (Lev. xvi, 20, 21.) This act of confession was a transfer of the people's sin, its guilt and corruption, to the animal, and its escape denoted their deliverance. The punished sin was symbolized in the slain goat, the pardoned sinner in the escaped goat. The profound significance of the passover dwindles, in the hands of the deniers of substitutional atonement, into a mere means on the part of God to mark the residences of the Israelitish people as distinguished from the houses of the Egyptians; whereas the blood of the paschal lamb upon the door-post not only showed where an Israelite lived, but declared that every Israelite was saved by the blood of the lamb, as a means of warding off death as a substitutionary sacrifice for the first-born of Israel, who, but for it, must have perished by the avenging angel with the first-born of Egypt. St. Paul must have known what it meant to the mind of a Jew, or he would not have said, "Christ, our Passover, is slain for us." And Jesus himself, in instituting his own supper at the close of the passover, explicitly avows and embodies the great fact of his dying to save; to save not only by the inward communication of his spirit of obedient self-surrender,

but also and principally as a ground of pardon: "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." The *ἀφέναι* cannot mean cleansing, except by implication; but literally and by the widest usage signifies letting go, freeing, removing barriers as opening sluices, remission, forgiveness. The Saviour's evident reference was to the old covenant, which was sealed by blood, and which based forgiveness only upon condition of shedding of blood. (Exod. xxiv, 8.)

Why should his supper commemorate his *death* rather than his birth, or any event of his life, except that it was the pregnant point of his career, as indicated in all the sacrificial types which preceded him? "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Lev. xvii, 11. These Old Testament sacrifices, we read in the New Testament, were *shadows* of the good things to come, the *substance* was Christ. They derived their power not from the entertainment which they gave to an ignorant, crude people—not from any adequate sense of sin which they were supposed to convey—but from their designed reference to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. It is not necessary to suppose that the Jew embraced in his knowledge their fullest spiritual significance; yet assuredly he did embrace enough to keep alive his faith in the deepest purpose of God in the creation of the world. The older Rationalists and Mr. Jowett tell us, that since the apostles, as Jews, were full of the Old Testament doctrine of expiation by sacrifice, it was the most natural thing for them to see the same doctrine in the life and death of Jesus. It is left for our modern vindicators of the character of God to find out that Jehovah never meant to teach what these apostles had learned from the sacred books. Abraham and the other patriarchs, Moses and the kings and the prophets, saw the day of Christ and were glad, but they did not understand what they saw, much less why they should be glad; they could not put this and that together, as through the smoke of their own sacrifices they looked down through the ages and caught the flashes which ascended to heaven from Calvary's altar; they could see no connection between the two; their sacrifices were only a dumb

show, given to them as a toy is given to a child to occupy it until it can comprehend and manage real things. Dr. Bushnell sees an argument for the absence of significance and power in the Old Testament sacrifices in their growing disuse as the moral sense of the Jews expanded. They outgrew such crudities! Did not the prophets charge this growing neglect rather to a growing wickedness than an expanding conscience? They, to the last recorded utterances of Malachi, reproach the people for robbing God of his dues in withholding the tithes and offerings. It was to their shame that they either brought nothing or brought only the blemished, such as were an abomination unto God. And whenever God speaks lightly of sacrifices, it is where those sacrifices are associated with corruption and are vainly presented without repentance and reformation. It is impossible to find that at any time God meant that the mere blood of the beast could take away sin, only as it was a sign, or the expression, of the deeper sacrifice of a broken and contrite spirit, and a symbol of that greater Sacrifice which was to appear once in the fullness of time as a satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. The age so boastingly called the advanced period of Israel was an age of apostasy—the purer age, on the contrary, was when the people brought of the best of their flocks, etc., to sacrifice regularly to the Lord. The flame of piety died with the flame of the altar, and only revived again at Pentecost, after that the sacrifice of the Lamb of God had found acceptance in heaven and obtained eternal redemption for men. The ancient sacrifices were valueless only as they diverted the mind from Christ and the holiness which it is the end of all religion to create, but so long as they kept the mind steadily on Christ as the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world they were of priceless value. It is only when brought into comparison as a ground and means of holiness with the blood of Jesus that their value vanishes. And when, too, God's great purpose is ripe to effect by the real sacrifice that which was hitherto only foreshadowed and anticipated—by the one great sacrifice of his Son—then they altogether vanish away. “For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when He cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-

offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." Heb. x, 4-6, 8, 9. The Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world" had now appeared, offered himself, and, all past as well as the present and future merging in him, the apostle could say, "Whom God hath set forth (preordained) to be a propitiation (a propitiatory sacrifice) through faith in his blood, to declare (demonstrate) his righteousness (justice) for the remission (forgiveness) of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, (because of his seeming impunity in overlooking transgression in the past;) to declare (demonstrate) at this (present) time his righteousness: (justice:) that he might be (is) just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." This sacrifice was that to which the ancient Jew looked by anticipation; it is that to which we now look by retrospection. It has already been shown how Christ derived from the passover the lesson, and henceforth embodied in his own Supper as a fact the truth, of his atoning death; it remains to quote but one among many instances in which he assumed for himself and his sacrifice the whole burden of meaning involved in the Old Testament ritual. "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. xx, 28. Here the evangelist puts into the mouth of Christ the very word, (*λύτρον*), *lutron*, by which the "Seventy" translate Exod. xxi, 30, *λύτρα*, a ransom, and the equivalent forfeited life; also (Lev. xxv, 24, 51,) the purchase price to be paid for a possession according to a just valuation. Take this in connection with the great event which Christ pointed out as approaching, (verse 18,) his betrayal and death, and it does seem indisputable that he designedly inculcated that his death was to be of the nature of a substitutionary satisfaction. He was to redeem the many by buying them out from the curse of the law. Otherwise how can we interpret language? (See Stier's "Words of the Lord Jesus," vol. iii, p. 81.) It is not claimed that the whole significance of Christ's life and work is to be found in the Old Testament ritual, but it is claimed that one vital connection

of the Old and New Testaments is the blood of expiation. Here they meet if nowhere else. Without shedding of blood is no pardon for the guilty. In the great truth of *satisfaction by substitution* as the only adequate explanation of the vicarious atonement the believer must rest. Nothing short of this as fundamental can meet the reason of the case, the wants of conscience, and the testimony of Holy Scripture. Tried by experience—the experience of myriads who overcame by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony—it alone stands the immutable rock on which Christ has founded his Church, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. If we may determine what is the most wholesome food for the body by ascertaining by what substances the body is nourished at its best state, so may we fairly infer what is truest, soundest doctrine for the Church, if we can find out what has been the belief of the Church in its purest and most victorious periods. No more decided and favorable answer is needed than that which comes from the lips of the more thoughtful and devout of the doubters of the doctrine of the vicarious expiatory sacrifice of Christ. Systems, like men, must be tested by their fruits. The sign never to be cut off is the ever-recurring miracle of the Cross. It makes a “holy people.” “The blood of Jesus Christ . . . cleanseth us from all sin.” “But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

ART. V.—CHURCH PROPERTY QUESTIONS IN THE SOUTH.

It is generally known that since the close of the war a number of questions, both legal and moral, have arisen in the South, bringing into controversy the legal claims and rightful ownership of certain Church property. Houses of worship, parsonages, and in some instances improved camp-grounds, are held and used by the members of one Church which are claimed as rightfully belonging to another Church. In some places the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church are in the possession and use of property which is claimed as exclusively be-

longing to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In other localities the case is reversed, the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, being in possession of similar property to which the Methodist Episcopal Church prefers an exclusive claim. Over these disputed questions parties have become greatly excited, and language has been used, both by the tongue and pen, which is inconsistent with a Christian spirit and unbecoming to the Christian name. Thereby much bitterness has been engendered, and unholy prejudices have been extensively developed and greatly strengthened.

There must be a lack of consistency, if not a want of sincerity, in a Church which denounces as criminal in the other Church an act which it persistently justifies in itself. It is easy to see that what is wrong in one locality cannot be right in another. What is a virtue in Virginia cannot be a vice in Tennessee, and what has been unmeasurably denounced as "Church stealing and robbery" in the Holston Conference cannot justly be characterized by any milder epithet when committed by the accusing party on the "sacred soil" of Maryland and Virginia.

There is no power in the place, nor in the blood of the perpetrator, to change the nature of a crime. It ought to embarrass a judge when called to pronounce sentence upon one who is no more guilty than himself. Happy is he who alloweth not in himself what he condemneth in another!

It is fair and charitable to presume that both parties in this unhappy controversy are honest in their convictions of right, and that each holds the property in dispute under what seems to it just claims either in equity or in law. Amid the excitements which have prevailed and the circumstances under which parties have acted this certainly is possible, and, being possible, the law of Christian charity demands it. Each party should make to the other this mutual concession. The lack of this charity might argue as great a want of religion in the spirit of the accuser as the thing he charges in the act of the accused. Honesty of motive may be conceded without any detriment to the real merits of the case.

These Church property cases in the South may all be arranged into four classes, which for the sake of convenience it may be better to consider separately. The first class we will designate

as the *Military Cases*. They came up first and during the war. They occurred mostly, if not entirely, in the Valley of the Mississippi. In time of war many things which are to be sacredly respected in a time of peace have to yield to what is denominated military necessity. None ought to understand this better than our brethren in the South. Property of all kinds may be seized and used, and destroyed even, if the exigencies of the occasion demand it. Churches are not exempt from such seizure. They are often taken for sanitary purposes and used as temporary hospitals. In our late war there was an additional motive for seizing churches in the South, namely, to weaken the power of the enemy. How this could be, may be inferred from the following extract taken from the letter of a Southern loyalist who had the best of opportunities for knowing whereof he affirms. To the truthfulness of his statements hundreds in the South are now able and willing to testify.

Rebel preachers are the worst class of men in the South, and did more to bring on the Rebellion, and to continue it, than any other class of traitors. They urged the young men of their charges to go into the rebel army, and, in the true spirit of blasphemy, assured them that, dying in so sacred a cause, they were sure to be saved. Thousands of young men religiously educated went into the rebel army through the influence of those ministers, became demoralized, and thus died.

These exhortations were given frequently from the pulpit, when the people were gathered together of a Sabbath day in the houses of worship. Thus churches were turned, as one writer says, "into recruiting camps" for the Confederate army. Rebel ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had then, and still have, a reputation for pre-eminence in this work. This reputation, whether well or ill-founded, reached the headquarters of the Federal armies, and was believed there. As a natural consequence, orders were issued to seize such churches as had this bad pre-eminence, and turn them over to the use of such ministers as were known to be loyal to the Government of the United States. This was no more than ought to have been expected when churches of this character came within the Federal lines. It was no more, probably not so much, as the Confederate army would have done with our churches under like circumstances. Several of those churches when seized were

assigned by the military authorities to the use of ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Our ministers temporarily accepted and used those churches for strictly religious purposes. Many of the pastors had fled before the approach of our armies, and our ministers preached to as many of their scattered flocks as would come to hear them, and also organized and instructed in them Sunday-school classes.

Where was the wrong in this? Was it in the war power in seizing the property of a disloyal Church to weaken the power of the enemy? Was it in authorizing our preachers to use them? Was it in our preachers in accepting them under the circumstances, or in our Church in allowing our preachers to preach the Gospel in them? Where is the precise point at which the rank offense was given? All the thunder of their indignation was let loose upon the Methodist Episcopal Church in general, and against the Bishop and ministers in particular who under the circumstances accepted the use of the churches. The impartial historian in years to come, when passion and prejudice shall have subsided, after a calm and impartial survey of the situation and all the attending circumstances, will find but little cause for censure in any thing that was done by us, but more in what was not done, in the fact that perpetual confiscation to the Government of all such Church property did not follow, as thousands of their members justly feared and expected.

Possibly it might have been wiser and better not to accept or use Church property even for religious purposes, under such circumstances, and possibly it would have been wrong not to do it. It is a question on which good men may innocently differ in judgment. To settle the exact merits of a question of that kind requires an amount of coolness and reflection which are neither natural nor easy under the powerful influences of war and of such a crisis as was then impending.

When the Government, whose military authority took possession of those churches, issued an order to return them to their original claimants, that order was promptly obeyed. With a knowledge of all the facts, an intelligent and impartial public must judge of the true merits of the case. If any wrong was done, or any lack of wisdom was manifested in using said churches under the circumstances, our ministers will, undoubt-

edly, when convinced of it, cheerfully acknowledge their error. Of all the Military Cases sufficient is now known, and enough has already been said. We therefore dismiss them, and pass to the consideration of

The second class of cases. For want of a better term we call them *Colored Cases*. In reference to these our Church has not much, if any, responsibility. They are all connected with certain meeting-houses, properly belonging to the colored people. Before the war colored congregations, composed mostly of slaves, could not hold property in their own right. When churches were built by them for their use, with their own means and labor, they were deeded to white trustees, who were to hold the legal title to the property for the benefit of those worshiping in them. After the war, during which slavery was abolished, when the colored man had been elevated to American citizenship, with all the rights of a citizen before the law, efforts were made in some places to secure the title to these churches to trustees of their own membership.

In the Louisiana Conference are forty-five houses of worship, all except three of which are deeded either to our Missionary Society, or held by trustees in accordance with the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Those three churches are in the city of New Orleans, and belong to the colored people, although the original deeds are held by white trustees, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Special Order No. 119, November 18, 1865, from Military Head-quarters in New Orleans, which turned over to white rebels the churches which the military authorities had seized and taken from them, reserved to all colored congregations the Church property then in their possession. Special Order No. 32, issued February 6, 1866, contained the following provisions:

The members of the colored congregations in this (Louisiana) department are authorized to exercise complete and absolute control over the Church property in their possession. And upon the election of trustees the management and control of all such property heretofore held, or now held, by trustees appointed in pursuance of any law of the State of Louisiana which forbids slaves to hold property, shall be turned over to said trustees, and the trustees now in possession shall transfer and vest in the trustees elected under the authority of the order above cited all the rights, interests and privileges, direct and indirect, connected with the control and management of this property.

It was the intent of Orders No. 32 and No. 119

That the aforesaid colored congregations may remain independent of denominational control, and be free to attach themselves to any Christian congregation according to their judgment and discretion.

Subsequently the three colored congregations worshipping in Winans Chapel, Wesley Chapel, and Soule Chapel, elected trustees according to the above order, and attached themselves to the Methodist Episcopal Church. Our Church has never claimed that property, but it has recognized and received those colored societies. The possession of the property remains just where the order of the United States Government placed it. Strange to say, these white trustees, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as we are creditably informed, have never obeyed the order, have not transferred and vested the title to said property as therein directed. When our Church was ordered to surrender and restore property we did so promptly. When the Church South was ordered to transfer and vest in trustees elected by the colored Societies the property which they had held for the benefit of those Societies, because of the law against slaves owning property, they took the responsibility to disobey. Why did they not obey? Was it because those colored Societies had connected themselves with the Methodist Episcopal Church? The world must judge between the two Churches. "By their works ye shall know them."

It must be remembered that these colored congregations built their own churches out of their own means. Under the new order of things they have a just right in law, equity, and morality, to this property—not only to its use, but to its formal ownership. It would be considered disreputable and wrong, even in a Jew, to withhold it under the circumstances: how much more in a professing Christian!

Cases of this kind are scattered over the South, except that outside of the Louisiana department there may have been no formal order for the transfer of such property. We are informed that several similar cases exist in Kentucky, and that the colored people are distinctly told that if they will unite with the Southern Methodists, or even with the African Methodist Episcopal Church, their property shall be transferred to them; but

if they connect themselves with the Methodist Episcopal Church it shall not be so transferred. Comments are unnecessary. All the colored cases in dispute of which we have any knowledge will fall into the same category. Further specifications are unnecessary.

The third class we will call the *Holston Conference Cases*. They arose after the war in East Tennessee, within the bounds of the Holston Conference. These are probably the most important cases connected with this unhappy controversy. In connection with these the Methodist Episcopal Church has been most bitterly denounced and most severely censured by Bishops, ministers, and the laity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. These cases, therefore, will require a more thorough investigation, and more minute and extended treatment. The merits of the questions here cannot be fully understood without going back to the circumstances of their origin, and carefully tracing their rise and growth to the present time. It is scriptural and just that the chief actors on both sides of the controversy be judged by their works. More or less of blame may be found on both sides; for to err is human, and the parties here are certainly very human. To acknowledge and confess one's faults, when convinced of them, is a highly Christian virtue. Though there may have been errors, wrongs, and follies even, committed by both parties, yet it is well to inquire which was first in the wrong, which has erred oftenest and most widely, and which has manifested and still manifests the greater unwillingness to adjust all differences and difficulties on the grounds of fairness and Christian equity. Why did the Methodist Episcopal Church enter this field after the war, from which her ministers had been wholly excluded since the great secession in 1845? By virtue of the so-called "Plan of Separation" the Southern Methodists claimed an exclusive right to this territory, and have insisted to this day that our Church has no right to send ministers and missionaries into the South, nor to organize conferences below Mason and Dixon's line. If it was wrong for the Methodist Episcopal Church to enter this field of labor, it must have been a still greater wrong to possess and use any Church property found existing here.

Our ministers entered this field for the same reason that Paul first went to Macedonia, because of a voice crying, "Come over

and help us." They followed the injunction of Wesley, "Go always not only to those that want you, but to those who want you most." They obeyed the Master who commanded, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." The ministers had still further warrant for going. The authorities of our Church appointed and ordered them to go. Wesleyan Methodism justly recognizes "the world as its parish," and repudiates the idea that any political or temporizing policy has any right to say to it, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther." It never ought and never will consent to be excluded from laboring in any part of the world of lost sinners to which there is in the providence of God an open door. That is a well-settled point in the grand and holy policy of Methodism.

A Convention of ministers and laymen of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, met, according to a call issued in May preceding, in Knoxville, Tennessee, July 7, 1864. The war was still raging, and only a small portion of the territory of this Conference was as yet included within the Federal lines. Hence many of those who wished to meet with their brethren could not be present. One old minister, Rev. E. Stockbridge, one of the best scholars in the South, it is said, when he came to the Confederate lines was stopped by the soldiers and stripped of his shoes. This, however, did not restrain him, for he then walked barefoot forty miles to be at the Convention. Fifty-seven delegates were present, twenty-seven of whom were ministers. The names of one hundred and twelve loyal ministers were reported, and at least forty more were believed to be loyal. The following item from the published proceedings will explain the kind of persons present, and the object of their meeting:

The Convention of the local ministry and membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and of those whose Church relations have been changed by expulsion for disloyalty to the Southern Confederacy, or by voluntary withdrawal, met according to a published call, and, after reading and prayer, was organized by electing Rev. E. E. Gillenwaters, Chairman, and Rev. R. G. Blackburn, Secretary. The objects of the Convention were then briefly stated by the chairman to be the gathering together of the loyal portion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, within the bounds of the Holston Conference, into legal and permanent organization, and the supplying of the Church with a devoted and spiritual pastorate.

The following is taken from the report of a special committee, and was unanimously adopted by the Convention :

Pursuant to public notice a Convention of loyal Methodists, laymen and preachers, local and traveling, convened in the city of Knoxville, Tennessee, on the 7th of July, 1864, to take into consideration the wants, prospects, and interests of the Methodist Church within the bounds of the Holston Annual Conference. The undersigned, a general committee to whom the subject was referred, have had the matter under serious and prayerful consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report :

"At an early period in this Rebellion the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, took her stand upon the treasonable, and therefore false, foundation of secession; her pulpits bellowed with more terrific thunder on the side of disunion than those of almost any other Church, hurling fiery invectives at the Union and the North, carrying most of the leading and influential portion of her ministers and members into the unhallowed embrace of treason. Under the administration of this our former Church, some of our ministers have been proscribed, some refused circuits and stations, and others expelled, all for opinion's sake, and because they were loyal to the United States. We have determined, therefore, no longer to live under the iron rule of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or to be associated in our Church relations with the men who control the interest of said Church, and are likely to direct her future movements. It therefore remains for us, and the loyal thousands of our brethren similarly situated, to do one of three things, either to remain in the wilderness, not of *Judea*, but of *Dixie*, and wander off into the mountains of sin and unbelief whence we came; or, next, to form ourselves into a separate and independent Church organization; or, last of all, to seek a re-union with the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, whose doctrines, usages, and faith are in accordance with ours, and in the enjoyment and practice of which we desire to live and die.

"We, therefore, report in favor of returning to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and asking most respectfully to be recognized by her, and provided as the Holston Annual Conference, giving our loyal preachers the lead in our new organization, subject to the control and authority of the appointed heads of our Church in the United States, and to her Discipline."

The following were among the resolutions reported by the said committee, and unanimously adopted by the Convention :

Resolved, That all who willingly engaged in this Rebellion have, in the eyes of the supreme law of the land, in the judgment of all enlightened nations, and especially in the feelings of every loyal heart of this vast continent, forfeited all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the government of the United States.

Resolved, That the loyal members and ministers of the Holston Conference are entitled in law to all property belonging to said ecclesiastical organization; and with the Divine blessing we intend to claim and hold the same, and rebuild the waste places of Zion.

Resolved, That the loyal people and preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, within the bounds of the Holston Conference, constitute said Church; and this Convention, acting for said Church and people, hereby propose, at the earliest day practicable, to transfer the same to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and that a committee be appointed to complete the negotiations, subject to the approval of those transferred.

The committee consisted of W. G. Brownlow, Chairman; W. H. Rogers, J. Albert Hyden, John Cox, Thomas H. Russell, T. P. Rutherford, James Cumming, W. C. Daily, D. P. Goss, Edwin A. Atlee, Ed. A. Ruble.

Let it be borne in mind that this Convention was held in July, 1864. That Convention was the result of causes which had been in operation for many months. In October, 1862, the Holston Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, convened in Athens, Tennessee. Bishop Early presided, whose zeal for the cause of the South may be inferred from these words, which he is reported to have said when about to ordain a class of ministers. Lifting his hands toward heaven he exclaimed, "God forbid that these hands should be laid upon the head of any man disloyal to the Southern Confederacy!"

Rev. Jonathan L. Mann, then a young member of the Conference, was present, and gives the following description:

In order to appreciate the doings of this Conference, we must first remember that the Confederacy was then at the highest climax of its glory, and that all rebeldom was sanguine of certain success. These things inspired (Bishop) Early and his rebel conclave to daring deeds of religious and ecclesiastical chivalry. They were surrounded by rebel soldiers, and cheered on by the presence and curses of the Provost Marshal at Athens, who might have been frequently seen in the gallery of the Conference-room during the sittings of the Conference, *swearing* what *he* would do with all the "Tory" or Lincolnite preachers of the Conference. The rebel members now had every thing their own way, without even the show of opposition. No Union member dared to enter his protest against even the most extreme measures that might be offered. Rebel bayonets and rebel prisons awed all of us into silence. Every Union minister of the Conference seemed to say, "If prudence will save my life, I will at least be cautious."

Under these circumstances one of the first measures of the Conference was to appoint a committee of investigation, whose business it was to examine the political status of every suspected character of the Conference. The following were that committee: John M. M'Teer, James S. Kenedy, W. H. Bates, A. G. Worley, Carroll Long. Before this inquisitorial committee were arraigned the following brethren: W. H. Rogers, W. H. H. Duggan, Wm. C. Daily, J. A. Hyden, P. H. Reed, John Spears, James Cumming, Thomas H. Russell, and Thomas P. Rutherford—nine in all, every one of whom was charged with disloyalty to the Confederacy.

To most of these brethren was put the question, "Do you sincerely love the Southern Confederacy in your heart?" Those who failed to give a satisfactory answer were either expelled, located, or left without an appointment.

The action of that Conference in these cases was based on a lengthy and elaborate report of that committee, the gist of which is contained in the following extract.

But now that these questions have assumed a *concrete form*, and under the inspiration of abolition fanaticism have kindled the fires of the most brutal and ruthless war ever known in the history of man, involving every interest, political and religious, held to be most sacred and absolutely vital to the present and future weal of our people, it is the deliberate and religious conviction of your committee that no patriot, no Christian, and, last of all, no Christian minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *South*, and a citizen of the Confederate States of America, and who is presumed to be even partially acquainted with the merits of this unhappy controversy, can throw the *weight* of his *opinions*, *words*, or *acts* into the *scales of our enemies against* us, with moral impunity or with a conscience void of offense toward God and his fellow countrymen.

That conclusion reached and adopted without a dissenting voice—for who under the circumstances would have the temerity to dissent?—the Conference proceeded to act upon the cases of political heresy. It is affirmed that Bishop Early, before reading out the appointments, said: "Brethren, when you go to your several fields of labor, *purge* the Church of its unworthy members," by which he was understood to mean, "Turn out all persons who are not loyal to the Southern Confederacy." The Conference had set them a worthy example in this kind of work. They were exhorted now to go to their charges and do likewise. Whether the ministers so understood the Bishop

or not, or whether they needed any exhortation, when they went to their charges, we are told that they, the disloyal portion of the Conference, eagerly commenced and zealously prosecuted the work of "purging the Church" of known Unionists, and thus hundreds if not thousands were cut off from membership. The preachers could not wait the slow process of a formal citation to appear and a trial by their peers. In many cases a summary process was adopted, and the names of the members deemed unworthy were by the minister stricken from the Church books, and those who were members a moment before were by a simple stroke of the pen dashed into excommunication. For nearly two years there followed a persecution which cannot be appreciated by those who did not feel it, the facts of which, when stated, would seem almost incredible. Then came the meeting of that Convention in Knoxville, in 1864.

Without the knowledge of the foregoing facts the significance of that Convention cannot be appreciated. It was an imploring voice from the representatives of thousands of sufferers, which cried out through that Convention, "Come over and help us!"

Did the Methodist Episcopal Church do right in responding to that call, and in sending ministers to take care of the scattered sheep thrust so rudely from their fold? Many of them were members before 1844, and had cherished, as the hope of their life, the thought of return to the bosom of the old Church that they might die in her embrace. Union men outside of the Church had no altar to flee to in affliction, no trustful guide to direct their faltering steps in the way of life. Did our Church do right in sending ministers to look after this class of persons, and point their tearful eyes to the Saviour of sinners?

Let us inquire into the state of society when our ministers entered upon their labors in this field and began the work of ecclesiastical and social reconstruction.

At the close of the war the ministers of the Church South in East Tennessee who had allied themselves to the Rebellion, with very few exceptions, had abandoned their spiritual charges. Some were chaplains in the Confederate service, some were colonels or captains, and some had enlisted as privates in the rebel army. Most of the others had left for safety when the Federal soldiers showed themselves in their neighborhoods.

Their flocks were literally scattered like sheep without a shepherd. The majority of the laymen had remained loyal to the Federal Government, and were determined, after what they had "felt and seen," to listen hereafter to none but loyal ministers. The loyal ministers of the Church South were also determined to identify themselves with the old Methodist Church, from which many of them had been separated in 1845 against their will and against their protest. Their old pastors gone, the people, who built their houses of worship, threw open their Church doors and invited our preachers to enter them and become their pastors. They did so, and that is the way the preachers "stole" their churches. If that is stealing, then our ministers are verily guilty. At the request of the people, or with their hearty concurrence, they were organized into Societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They came to us by thousands. They knocked at our door and it was opened unto them. In this the Scripture was fulfilled, "Knock and it shall be opened unto you." They brought with them the houses which they had built out of their own labor and money, and which they supposed they justly owned.

There was a general feeling and belief among the laity, which was shared largely by ministers who have not yet identified themselves with our Church, that as slavery was abolished—the original cause of the separation—hereafter there would be but one Methodist organization in the South, and that must of necessity be under the organization that had proved loyal to the Government during the war. These convictions were very natural. They were living facts at the time. Under these convictions, at the close of the war almost the entire laity, with the loyal outsiders, rallied to our standards, and nearly the whole population in the different towns and villages were rejoicing in the privilege of going up again to the house of God in company. The membership of our Church rapidly increased, and the ministers had not the slightest idea of any wrong or imprudence in occupying, as they did, the houses of worship. We have been told by those who were witnesses of the fact that this state of society was nearly universal in East Tennessee. Things were rapidly settling into harmony and peace, and there was an excellent hope for the future. All this while our preachers were quietly cultivating the field.

We come now to chronicle a great and radical change. Who was responsible for it? We shall see. Things were not allowed to remain long in this quiet, hopeful way. After President Johnson had taken his "new departure," and had swung completely "round the circle," he gave an unexpected hope to the rebels of the whole South. What may have been intended by the President only for political effect touched every chord in society, and produced not only a profound sensation, but a complete revolution in the spirit of the vanquished South. It permeated society, and reached even into ecclesiastical affairs. It was seen property was not to be confiscated, that traitors were not to be punished, that the absent might safely return home. In a little while the absent shepherds of the Church South returned, and, having laid off the Confederate gray and their official uniform, donned again their priestly garb. Not desiring to return to the bosom of the Old Church, which had been so loyal to the Government whose power they sought to overthrow, and not liking to be without a sympathizing flock, they began to exhort their former friends who had allied their hopes to the now lost cause to remain in a separate Church organization, and not identify themselves with the Methodist Episcopal Church. To this end all their activity and influence were directed. Soon the old hostility which had begun to expire commenced to revive, and a broad line of distinction began to be drawn in some of the Societies. The Church South under their leadership undertook to re-erect her fallen altars, and to rekindle her extinct fires. No one can tell how much the cause of social and religious reconstruction was hindered by this movement. Eternity alone can reveal it.

It was not long before a demand was made for the restoration of their churches. They claimed a right to control all Church property in the hands of Methodists within the bounds of the Conference. The question now naturally arises, "Why did not our people promptly surrender to the control of those ministers all the Church property demanded?" This question is certainly pertinent to the case, and careful attention is invited specially at this point of the inquiry.

All this property, or nearly all of it, was in the hands of trustees, many of whom were Union men, and had suffered, as they believed, at the instigation of those ministers, or with their

approval, great persecution on account of their Union sentiments. They did not, therefore, feel very much inclined to gratify their ex-pastors by a compliance with their request. Simultaneously with the demands for the return of this property, threats were extensively made by many disloyal persons that the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church would soon be compelled to leave the country, and that native Union men would find it too hot for them to remain. The threatening spirit of persecution became generally rampant, and Union men believed, from strong circumstantial evidence, that some of those ministers were the instigators of it. None of them tried to restrain it, none by words disapproved of it, many said it ought to be done, and all seemed to predict that it would certainly be accomplished. This raised a new issue, and put Unionists somewhat on the defensive, and, being in possession of the churches, they felt the pressure of a kind of military necessity to hold them as a means of self-defense. These facts are not generally known outside of the country where they transpired; but they are facts, nevertheless, that ought to be known in connection with this question.

Many suits were brought in the local courts to recover this property; but they generally, if not universally, failed. Legal decisions sanctioned or confirmed our people in the possession of those houses of worship. There were other grave and weighty considerations connected with these cases which seemed to the people—for the people, not the ministers, claimed and held these churches—which seemed, I say, to the people a sufficient justification of their course, both legally and morally. They honestly believed that the Church South, by the course which it pursued in the Rebellion, had justly forfeited all right and title to the property claimed by it. That fact was fully expressed in one of the resolutions adopted by the Knoxville Convention.

Quite a number of these houses of worship were built before the great secession in 1845, and were deeded to trustees to be held for the use of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. The deeds had never been changed. The trustees holding the deeds became members of our Church, and brought their property with them, supposing that they were fulfilling their high trust in restoring them to the old Church from which they had been forced away. Providence had opened a way for the

Church to receive back her own, and they were delighted to be able to place her again in her rightful possession.

Another class of this property had not been deeded at all. Parties who owned the land and assisted to build the houses steadfastly refused to deed them to the Church South. Having possession of property of this class, and knowing all the facts in the case, they felt justified in refusing to surrender it. Some of this property has since been deeded by its legal owners to trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church according to the provisions of the Discipline.

Another class of Church property was deeded to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, built since 1845. On some of the houses of worship debts had accumulated before the war, and legal judgments hung over them. Others had been repaired at considerable expense. Paying off the judgments and making repairs our people had a just lien upon them, and, of course, would not surrender them until their liens were satisfied.

Other cases were of this nature: The property held was created wholly or in part by the members of our Church and the congregations worshipping in them, and our people believed and felt that they had claims in equity on that property, and were unwilling to surrender it until there was a manifested willingness on the part of the Church South to settle the difficulty on the grounds of equity.

Every Church property in dispute between us in the Holston Conference, known to the writer, comes legitimately under one or another of the classes above referred to. These considerations may not furnish claims which impartial courts would respect in all cases, but they were of sufficient weight to create a firm belief in our people that those claims are sound, both morally and legally; and holding property under such circumstances until some authorized legal or ecclesiastical tribunal shall decide upon the claims, cannot by any fairness be termed "stealing," "robbery," dishonest, immoral, or unchristian. It is not in the power of a respectable casuistry to fix the guilt of fraud or dishonesty where the parties act under such honest convictions that religiously and morally they are doing right.

When these demands were made for an immediate surrender of the property in dispute, the Church South demanded and insisted upon the pound of flesh. All the churches and par-

sonages must be at once given up, for they were the property, they said, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There was no proposition to settle a single case on the grounds of equity, nor to allow in any case our preachers to preach in them. This was their spirit at first, and not until within a few months has there appeared the slightest indication of a disposition to soften down in the tone of their demands.

Thus matters went on until 1868, when the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, sent a memorial to our General Conference in Chicago, requesting its interference to secure them in the repossession of the property which they claimed was unjustly and unlawfully withheld from them by the Holston Conference, over which they had jurisdiction. That memorial was received, referred to a special committee, and reported upon. The whole matter was referred back to the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with the expressed belief that it was "disposed to do right."

At the session of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Jonesborough Oct. 9, 1869, the following memorial was received through Prof. Edmund Longley, of Emory and Henry College.

To the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in session in Jonesborough, Tenn.

WE the undersigned were appointed a committee by the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at its last session, held at Abingdon, Va., to ask in the spirit of Christ your reverend body that you will at your present session, by such action as you may deem best, and so far as it is in your power, either repossess the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of all her property now held by the Methodist Episcopal Church within your bounds, or that you will declare to us the grounds, both moral and legal, upon which you are holding and using this property.

Our committee are the more encouraged to make this request of your reverend body because your General Conference, at its last session in Chicago, in May, 1868, referred all papers in regard to this subject, including, we suppose, a memorial sent to that body by the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to your body, "believing," as they say, "that you will be careful to do justly," etc. (See Journal of your General Conference, 1868, page 633.)

These papers, we learned from your secretary, in October last were received and by your order filed with the papers of your Con-

ference. You are thus, as a Conference, placed in position to adjust this whole property question, touching the moral aspects of the case.

Again, there is, we think, a prevailing desire that there shall exist every-where among us, as Methodists, the spirit of brotherly kindness and charity. A great hinderance to this is found, we think, in the fact that our property rights, as we understand them, are not recognized nor respected by your body. Cannot something be done by which a better state of things can be secured? We believe that there can be, and in the hope of it we are here. We request that if it be your pleasure this communication be read to your Conference, and that you take measures to confer with us in such manner as you deem best. We will be found at the law office of J. E. Reeves, Esq.

This paper would have been presented earlier in your session, but some members of our committee have been detained by unavoidable circumstances.

Respectfully,

E. E. WILEY,

B. ABROGAST,

R. N. PRICE,

F. W. EARNEST,

E. CLAY REEVES.

A special committee of five was appointed to confer with the committee above named, to whom this memorial was referred. The following is that committee's report:

The committee appointed by the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church to meet and confer with a committee of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, on the subject contained in their memorial to this Conference, and to whom said memorial was referred, have attended to their duty as best they could under the circumstances, and submit the following as their report:

Our interview with that committee was very pleasant, and, so far as the spirit manifested is concerned, was to us perfectly satisfactory. They were frank and clear in all their statements in regard to the subject before us. We endeavored to meet them in the same Christian spirit of frankness, courtesy, and kindness.

The main object of your committee in the interview was to ascertain, as definitely as possible, precisely what they wanted, and their views as to the best manner in which the whole subject pending could be satisfactorily adjusted.

The following is their own statement of their views, in regard to which they express the belief that they properly represent the views of their Conference.

"1. That the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is entitled to all the property acquired by the Plan of Separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844, as well as to all property acquired by our Church since the separation, except such as may have passed out of our hands by due process of law.

"2. That all such property should be restored to our Church immediately.

"3. That if the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church have, by paying debts or otherwise, acquired a just lien on any property of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, they are entitled to have such lien properly satisfied.

"4. That in case of restoration of property it will be highly proper for our ministers and members to exercise toward the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church courtesy and magnanimity.

"5. That where a majority of those who may have contributed to the acquisition of Church property may have adhered to the Methodist Episcopal Church it might seem hard to eject them from such property, and it would, therefore, be right that our congregations should, in such cases, make such concessions and compromises as may alleviate the cases so far as possible, without the surrender of vested rights."

Before making our reply and recommendation in reference to the whole subject thus presented, a preliminary question seems to require a little consideration at this time and in this report. This question has reference to the grounds on which the members of our Church justify themselves both in originally possessing and afterward holding the property in dispute. The necessity of this consideration arises from the fact, that unjust charges are frequently made in the newspapers, public addresses, and very often in private conversation, against us as "church thieves" and "robbers of churches." These things are very unpleasant to us and damaging to the cause of God and our reputation in places where the facts in the case are not fully understood.

These charges were not made nor insinuated by the committee of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Their language to us was far above such insinuations and charges, indicating that in their view of the case such charges could not, in any sense of propriety, be made against our Church, except in the application of principles which in other sections of the country would make the Church South equally guilty of precisely the same crimes. There is ground on which both parties can stand, and do stand, without involving a particle of the guilt of theft or robbery.

We are satisfied that wherever members of our Church have possessed themselves of property claimed by the Church South, they have done so on the ground of honest and settled belief that before God and men they had a just right to do so, either in equity or in law.

This subject, as related to civil and ecclesiastical law, is of such a nature, so complicate and involved, that we find many lawyers of acknowledged ability who entertain on the subject the same beliefs as our people do, and when consulted give corresponding legal opinions. We cannot, therefore, reasonably expect that our people will be clearer-headed or wiser in their judgment on this subject

than such devoted students of the law. Acting honestly, therefore, under these beliefs and under legal advice, they cannot in any just sense be either *thieves* or *robbers*.

We are willing to and do cheerfully accord the same honesty of belief and intention to members of the Church South, wherever they have done similar things as it regards property which they occupy, claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church as rightfully vested in it.

In coming to the subject as now presented for our consideration and action, we earnestly desire in the spirit of Christ so to act and so to recommend action on the part of others that peace may speedily ensue throughout our entire work, and that all unsettled questions of property in dispute between us may be so amicably and satisfactorily settled that brotherly love and a fraternal spirit may both exist and abound between these two branches of Methodism, and that, if God so will it, organic union may soon succeed to this oneness of spirit.

The propositions of our brethren of the Church South contemplate the settlement of questions occurring only within the bounds of the Holston Conference. Our first convictions were, that our report should have reference to these questions only; but the more we considered the subject that our Methodism is one, and that the settlement of the questions here should be upon the same principle as similar questions elsewhere, and when we take into account the fact that more Church property claimed by the Methodist Episcopal Church is in the possession of the Church South, in the States of Virginia and Maryland, than they claim that we occupy of theirs within the bounds of the Holston Conference, we thought that it would be better and wiser, and we trust quite as acceptable to our brethren on the other committee, to base our action and recommendation on some general principle which might be adopted throughout the Church in every case where similar difficulties have arisen or may arise in the final settlement of the right to Church property.

And we do hereby declare our entire willingness to settle, so far as we have power, all the questions within the bounds of the Holston Conference on the same basis which our brethren of the Church South will agree to in Virginia and Maryland where churches claimed by us are occupied by the Church South. This we have no reason to doubt will meet the view of our brethren of the Church South, who, as well as we, will rejoice to observe the golden rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The plan of settlement which your committee recommend is this:

Inasmuch as pacific and fraternal measures were recommended by our last General Conference, and a board of commissioners having been appointed to treat with a like board which we expect will be appointed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at its approaching General Conference, in reference to a prospective union of the two Churches—and as the satisfactory settlement of

these property questions is necessarily involved and must be effected prior to any union—and as the response of the Bishops of the Church South to the fraternal letter of our Bishops officially informing them of the action and desire of our General Conference breathes a kind and Christian spirit, and indicates the same strong desire on their part to have the existing difficulties properly adjusted, so that there may be peace between us—and as we do not wish in any manner to increase the difficulties in the way of their prospective action, your committee, therefore, recommend the reference of this whole question for a uniform plan of adjustment to that joint board of commissioners of the two Churches, and that the Conference now pledge itself, so far as it may be concerned, and has power and influence, to abide by and conform to any plan or principle which that joint commission shall agree to recommend to both Churches, and that as members of this Conference we will use our influence to induce all our people to carry out the same plan in the adjustment of our difficulties which may remain unsettled.

In the meantime we earnestly recommend to the members of our Church holding property claimed by the Church South to endeavor amicably to adjust all existing disagreements, so far as in their power, upon the highest principles of equity and Christian charity. And we earnestly hope that our brethren, in any attempt at adjustment, will treat with the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the true spirit of Christian courtesy and magnanimity.

N. E. COBLEIGH,	J. B. LITTLE,
F. M. FARMING,	J. A. HYDEN,
J. R. EADS.	

That report was unanimously adopted without debate. It was entirely unsatisfactory to the other committee. No notice was taken of the subject by their succeeding General Conference; and there has seemed to be no disposition on the part of the Church South, generally, to meet our brethren in the spirit we recommended. We know of but a single case where the matter in dispute has been settled in this way. This is the church house in Jonesborough, where the Conference was in session when the report was read and adopted.

The effect of this report, however, on both sides, was like oil on the troubled waters. The spirit of our own people afterward was much more kind and conciliatory. The other party, finding themselves arraigned before the public and involved in the same criminality as they alleged against us, lowered very much their tone of complaint and abated the severity of their language. That report was an era in the controversy.

All these difficulties can be easily adjusted if our brethren of the Church South will approach the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Holston Conference, who hold the property in dispute in their possession, in a kind, Christian spirit. Convince our people of what is right, and they will be ready and willing to do right, whatever that may be. They are tired of this controversy, and want it settled. They are willing to concede more than they believe justice or equity can require; but they are men of sensibility and men of honor, and must be approached and treated as such. They are not "thieves and robbers;" and before they will compromise these matters those unjust and unchristian charges must be withdrawn. They are not regarded as such even by their enemies in the communities where they live, but are respected and treated as gentlemen and Christians.

Our preachers, our conferences even, have never had more than an advisory influence in this matter. Local trustees hold and control the property. They will adjust all these questions on the grounds of equity whenever our brethren on the other side will meet them in the same spirit. The Church South cannot afford to have the questions settled on any other ground. A public Christian sentiment will not sanction any other. Either party can better afford to lose the whole property concerned than to seriously damage their Christian reputation, or their moral and religious influence.

There is one point in these cases that should not be overlooked or lightly estimated. The persons who claim rights in this disputed property were formerly members of the Church South. They helped to create its value, and are entitled in equity to their *pro rata* interest in it. They were either expelled, or forced by persecution, or constrained by moral causes, from that Church because of their loyalty to the National Government. But for this highly patriotic virtue their Church relations would not have been disturbed. Should that loyalty in them work a forfeiture of their sacred rights in church property, which was created, in part at least, by their labors, means, and sacrifices? Will the civil government stand by and see men deprived of their rights for such an offense—rather, for such a rare virtue in the South? Is the Church South willing to risk its future in assisting to make and enter such a chapter

in its ecclesiastical history? Will the loyal North look on with indifference, and speak no word of vindication for men who suffered like martyrs, and then have to submit to be defrauded of sacred rights as a requital for their fidelity to a glorious principle? There is more in these Church property questions than lies upon the surface. The Church South, if need be, should be made to feel the wholesome pressure of a healthy public sentiment, and be constrained thereby to an equitable settlement on grounds that the Christian public will approve.

The fourth class of cases comprises those which have occurred within the bounds of what was the old Baltimore Conference. As they exist in what is now known as the Virginia Conference, we will call them the *Virginia Cases*, though some of them may be in the State of Maryland. The Baltimore Conference did not go with the South in the great secession in 1844-5. They bravely fought through the conflict and excitement under the banner of Old Mother Church. The legal fiction of the so-called "Plan of Separation" cannot be extended so as to claim any property in the bounds of that Conference originally deeded to the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1861 a portion of the ministers of that Conference withdrew, and finally joined the Church South, being dissatisfied with the action of the preceding General Conference at Buffalo in reference to the chapter in the Discipline on slavery. During the war some of the churches and parsonages belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church were seized, both in Maryland and Virginia, by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There is said to be more of this Church property seized by them, and retained to this day in the possession of the Church South, than they claim that our people hold of their property in East Tennessee. Some of those houses of worship which they do not use, it is said, they nail up and refuse to let the lawful owners, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, occupy them for religious worship.

Rev. E. P. Phelps, of the Virginia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in an appeal to the people in 1868, says :

We claim for the Methodist Episcopal Church the property, houses of worship and parsonages, that have been built for the use of her members and ministers. This claim is denied, and we are

excluded from many of them. We base this claim both upon justice and law.

In 1869 the Virginia Conference said in its Pastoral Address :

In portions of our bounds we labor under difficulties because of exclusion from houses of worship built for the use of our members and ministers, the right to the use of which we claim upon both moral and legal grounds. Because we make this claim we have been denounced as "house-stealers and robbers;" but this will not divert us from our purpose, if possible, to possess them. We claim no property but that which was in the bounds of the Baltimore Conference, and such as the Church South had no claim upon arising out of the so-called Plan of Separation.

Says the Rev. E. P. Phelps, in a letter published in the "Christian Advocate," June 8, 1871 :

Yet we are excluded from a large number of churches and parsonages. If the leaders of the Church South are willing to risk the verdict of history as to their course they can do so. That verdict will not be rendered by passion engendered and inflamed by slavery and rebellion, but in the light of liberty, truth, and justice.

Mr. Phelps further says :

The Legislature of Virginia, backed by ministers, members, and friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, propose to *deprive us of our rights*, to shut out ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church from these houses, to establish worship in them under the authority of a Church for whose members they were not built, and for whom they could not have been built in former years. *We may worship in them, if we will change our Church relations or practically renounce them.* Where is the robbing now? Who seeks to break the bond to deprive others of their rights? The people, the masses, will decide.

Under some circumstances legislatures can be influenced to pass an unjust law, the operation of which will defraud citizens of their rights. Is it possible that professedly Christian people will stoop so low as to not only favor such a scheme of fraud, but even to assist in trying to bring it about? To succeed in such a scheme will prove worse than a failure. If encouraging holiness, awakening sinners and leading them to Christ, is an important part of the work of a Christian people, they cannot afford to be implicated in any species of voluntary wrong-doing. They must avoid the very appearance of evil, or they will forfeit the favor of God and lose their moral influence among men. They may achieve success, but they will gain a loss of power. God

will give them flesh to eat, but send leanness into their souls and throughout their Churches. Better a thousand times for a Christian people to have poor houses of worship, or none at all, with the favor and blessing of God resting upon them, than to abound in fine and costly churches with the spirit of God departed from them. These remarks will apply equally to both sides of this controversy, to any and to all Christian Churches.

Mr. Phelps gives the arguments used by the friends of the Church South in justification of their withholding this church property as follows:

1. "The ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church have no business here." By what law or by what policy excluded? Why may not our ministers go and preach to those who want to hear them in Virginia, as well as to the Feejee Islands, or to the same class of people in any other State in the Union?

2. "The Methodist Episcopal Church has not been in sympathy with the South?" Of course not, so far as slavery and rebellion are concerned. Does that comprise what they mean by "The South?"

3. "The people do not want you." Who are the people? Those who still favor slavery and rebellion do not want us, it is true. They, however, are not all the *people* of Virginia. Those of the people who are loyal to the government of the United States do want our Church and our ministers, and mean to have them, with or without their houses of worship; and that Government which a vital Christianity upholds should see to it that our rights are properly respected and secured.

4. "You are disturbers of the peace." Just as the lamb would disturb the peace of the wolf until the latter could devour it: just as a loyal voter in the South disturbs the peace of a community until the Ku-Klux go for him and secure his disappearance. Our ministers and people are peaceable; they preach peace, breathe peace, and pursue it until other parties who hate them become the real disturbers of the peace. They are disturbers of the peace just as the Orangemen were in New York a short time ago, when the Catholic Irish determined that they should not have a procession in the city. These flimsy pretenses are too transparent to be of any service, except to show the folly and the weakness of the cause of those who gravely put them forth. American public opinion, at whose

bar all these cases must be tried and decided, is not to be turned aside by them. The truth will come at last, and in its light opinions will finally be reversed, modified, or confirmed, according to the facts in the case.

How the Church South, with her record of the property cases in Virginia, can, without blushing, call our brethren in East Tennessee "church stealers and robbers," is one of those difficult questions in human nature that require a special solution. It is truly enigmatical; yet there may be a key which, when applied, will unlock the whole mystery. All these property questions are intimately connected with the spirit of the rebellion, as will appear from a close and comprehensive study of them. Not one of them can be thoroughly and properly understood with the influence of that spirit left out of view. Those who may hereafter attempt to aid in the settlement of these questions should enter upon the work with a full knowledge of this fact. It may be proper in the conclusion of this article to bring into view a few things.

1. The entrance of our ministers into the South after the war, and their labors in this field, were intensely and persistently opposed by the leading ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Proof of this is abundant. Their Bishops, Editors, and influential leaders have put their evidence upon record. Their official Church papers have been burdened with editorials and correspondence on this subject. Those who were most eager for the Southern Confederacy were, and still are, most bitter and earnest in their opposition. They wanted our loyalty, our literature, our instruction, and our influence entirely excluded from the Southern field. The source of the inspiration of that opposition is manifestly from the spirit of the rebellion. It is almost like one of the axioms of Euclid, self-evident.

2. They predicted an early withdrawal of our Church from this field, as they redoubled the force of their opposition. The demand for an immediate surrender of the churches which they claimed in Tennessee—the seizing, holding, and refusing to give up to us our Church property in Maryland and Virginia—were only practical forms of that opposition to compel the withdrawal which they had predicted. Their refusal to settle these questions on the grounds of equity is of the same spirit.

They do not propose by word or deed to encourage us to remain by the equitable settlement of these questions.

3. From the same source has proceeded a more diplomatic operation to produce a divided sentiment among our friends at the North. Our friends at the North desire re-union. They think the cause of Christianity would be promoted thereby. This is undoubtedly true. So, whenever our Southern brethren meet or correspond with any of our brethren from the North, they say to them, "We, too, want union; but we cannot consent to make any arrangements for it till you restore the property unjustly seized and kept from us. Withdraw all your forces and give us the entire field of the South; then we will begin to talk about re-union." Some of our brethren seem wonderfully taken with this fine talk, and are more than half-inclined to comply with their request. Their object is perfectly consistent with the spirit of this opposition. They want to force our Church to leave the field. In this they will not succeed. The authority of the great commission forbids it; the spirit and progress of the age are against it; the fixed purpose of our Church is opposed to it. Do all these things find their explanation in a cherished hope of yet gaining "the lost cause?"

4. Consider well another fact. The leading men of the South, in and out of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, whose hearts and hands were in the rebellion, have not given up all hopes of yet securing an independent Southern Confederacy. They cannot tell you how it is to be brought about, but they confidently expect it. It may be by sharp political maneuvering, or as the result of another hard-fought war. This idea crops out occasionally in the eloquence of some fiery orator in a public harrangue, who is more noted for zeal than for wisdom. In private circles of select friends, when no hostile ear is presumed to be nigh, this subject is most confidentially talked over. Occasionally the conversation is overheard by ears that learned to listen at windows and doors before the war and during its terrible progress. Their secrets, therefore, are not secrets. While the evidence of this hope in them may not be tangible, so as to be put in proper form for the courts, yet its ethereal essence is sufficiently diffused abroad to produce almost universal belief among the Southern loyalists.

If there is but even a slight probability that an attempt may be made hereafter to revive and to restore the "lost cause," the spirit and influence of a pure Gospel should be earnestly and rapidly diffused throughout the South, that the hearts of the people may be converted to God, and saved from the sin and the fearful consequences of an attempt at another rebellion.

This article has been written entirely in the interests of truth. The writer has expressed only what he sincerely believes to be true. Yet human knowledge at best is imperfect, and its sources may sometimes render it uncertain. If any statement shall prove to be incorrect, the writer will be most happy to make the requisite acknowledgment when convinced of his mistake or error. As far as possible, it is desirable, to "let by-gones be by-gones;" but in presenting these property cases, well-authenticated facts had to be referred to and re-stated, from their vital connections with or important bearings upon the questions. They have been stated, not for the purpose of reflecting upon our brethren of the Church South, but simply for the purpose of putting the cases fairly before an intelligent public. Wherever the Methodist Episcopal Church, or any of its ministers, have done wrong, we have no desire to screen them; but where they have been maligned or misrepresented, we have aimed simply to set them truthfully before the public. As we are all hastening to that tribunal before which all disguises will be stripped off, and where each will be judged and rewarded according to his works, while we deal charitably and kindly we should also deal honestly and truthfully with each other. The truth is mighty and will prevail.

ART. VI.—SOCRATES.

ABOUT the middle of the sixth century before Christ the Grecian States had reached the height of their prosperity and glory. Athens in particular, under the administration of Pericles, stood forth unrivaled in arts, in literature, and in arms. The generation was yet upon the stage that had witnessed and shared in the victories of Marathon and Salamis, the triumph of the Greeks over the veteran myriads of Persia. For forty

years together—from the years 470 to 430 before Christ—Athens enjoyed high and uninterrupted prosperity. Her ships commanded the seas, and poured in upon her the treasures of distant lands; her artists wrought her marble into innumerable forms of beauty and majesty; every species of literature—history, poetry, and eloquence—was cultivated and carried forward to perfection. This was the age of Aristides, Thucydides, Anaxagoras, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Pericles, and, more than all, Socrates.

Socrates was born at Athens in the year 469 before Christ. Here he spent nearly the whole of his life, and here he died in the year 399 before Christ, at the age of seventy. His parents were in humble life, his father, Sophroniscus, being a sculptor, and his mother, Phenarète, a midwife. He was trained to the business of his father, and wrought in marble with his own hands for many years. Some pieces of his statuary are thought to be still extant. He was favored with such an education as the schools of Athens afforded, and early formed an acquaintance with some of the philosophers. He was particularly attached to Archelaus, a follower of Anaxagoras, and studied physics under his direction; but in this branch of science, as it was then taught, he felt no interest, and soon came to despise and reject it. The contradictory hypotheses which he heard presented, and the utter confusion in which it was involved, brought him to the conviction that the gods intended that the machinery by which they brought about astronomical and physical changes should not be known, and that to pry into their secrets was both impious and vain. He thought that “the proper study of mankind was man,” and to this he gave his chief attention.

Socrates was unfortunate in his marriage. For her irritable and abusive temper and tongue his wife, Xanthippe, has become a proverb. It must be admitted, however, in excuse for her, that he was not a model husband. He was never at home, and made little or no provision for his family. On his inviting some wealthy persons to take supper with him, his wife complained that they had nothing suitable to be set before them. To this he replied, “If they are worthy people they will be satisfied; and if not, we need care nothing for them.” To a friend who inquired why he did not study to improve the temper

of his wife, he said, "I accept her as a needed discipline to prepare me for the management of men, just as those who break horses begin with the most intractable first, after which others can be controlled more easily." After all, it is evident that Xanthippe loved her husband. This is clear from the interest which she felt for him at the last. His tender regard for her appears in his committing her, at parting, to the special care of his friends. Socrates had several children, who survived him.

In his personal appearance our philosopher had nothing to recommend him. He had a large, strong-built frame, with a bald head, prominent eyes, flat nose, thick lips, and a belly as protuberant as that of Falstaff. His dress, too, was coarse and threadbare, and in all places and at all times he went barefoot. No wonder that his odd, uncouth appearance exposed him to the ridicule of the thoughtless multitude. His wealthy friends pitied him, and would have assisted him to any amount, but he spurned their offers as superfluous and unnecessary. Alcibiades offered him land on which to build a house, but he declined it. Charmides would have given him slaves, from whose labor he might have derived revenue, but he would not accept them. Passing the shops where articles were sold he would say to himself, "How many things there are of which I have no need!"

Like some other great philosophers, Socrates was often absent-minded. On one occasion, when abroad as a soldier, he is said to have stood a whole day in one spot, with his eyes fixed, absorbed in thought, as though in an entranced condition. This reminds us of Sir Isaac Newton, who, on rising from bed and getting one leg into his trousers, remained in that position for hours. On another occasion, perhaps more wonderful, Newton lost his dinner by his illusory speculations, thinking that he had taken it when he had not.

Socrates never left Athens except on two or three occasions when he was drafted as a soldier. He first entered the ranks at Potidæa, just before the commencement of the Peloponnesian war. The service here was one of great hardship. It was in the winter, and the climate was severe. While others were putting on coats and wrapping their feet in wool, Socrates wore his usual coarse garments, and marched barefoot on the ice. It was at this time that he rescued his wounded friend Alcibiades, and bore him in triumph from the field.

Socrates's next military service was at the battle of Delium, in the eighth year of the Peloponnesian war. Here the Athenians were defeated and obliged to retreat. Again Socrates saved Alcibiades and secured his retreat, and that of one of the generals. In the same year we again find him a soldier in Thrace, but of this adventure no particulars are mentioned. Socrates sometimes served his country in the capacity of a civilian. On one occasion he was a member of the Council of Five Hundred, and it devolved on him to preside over their deliberations when the generals who commanded at Arginusæ were brought before them for trial. These generals had done their duty bravely, and gained a splendid victory; but on their return were accused of neglecting the bodies of the dead who perished on the field. Public prejudice was strong against them, and if the question had come to a vote they would have been condemned; but Socrates, who appreciated their merits and knew their innocence, would not put the question. He resisted all the influence which could be brought to bear upon him, and thus saved their lives.

Subsequent to this, when the oligarchy had been established and the thirty tyrants were in power, they had marked out Leon of Salamis for destruction, and so they deputed Socrates and four others to go to Salamis and bring Leon to Athens that he might be slain; but Socrates would have nothing to do with such wickedness. He left the other four to go without him, and Leon was put to death; but Socrates chose rather to hazard his own life than to betray innocent blood. We mention these instances to show his firmness in circumstances which literally "tried men's souls."

Socrates was not altogether free from the superstitions of the age in which he lived. This could not be expected of him. He worshiped the Grecian gods and goddesses, and believed that they interposed continually in the affairs of men. He believed himself to be under the special direction of an invisible genius, commonly called his demon, who did not counsel him what to do, but rather what to avoid. Through the greater part of his life he followed the suggestions of this guardian spirit, and abstained from whatever he was warned to shun. He consulted the heathen oracles, and had confidence in them. It was a response from the shrine at Delphos which led him to renounce

secular employment, and enter upon the course of life in which he spent the remainder of his days. His friend Chærephon had inquired at Delphos, "Who is the wisest man in Greece?" The priestess answered, "Socrates is the wisest man." On hearing this declaration Socrates was greatly perplexed; he knew not how to understand it. At length, after a distressing struggle, he resolved to test the accuracy of the infallible priestess by taking the measure of the wisdom of others in comparison with his own. So, selecting a leading politician renowned for his wisdom, he entered into conversation with him, and put to him some searching, Socratic questions. The answers which he received convinced him that this man's wisdom was no wisdom at all. Still the politician himself was not convinced, but thought himself as wise as ever. Whereupon Socrates said, "I am wiser than this man, for I know my own ignorance and he does not." Socrates repeated the experiment upon several individuals who were in repute for wisdom, but always with the same result. In this way he commenced that peculiar work to which he regarded himself as exalted of God, nor would he desist from it until it cost him his life.

Socrates never pretended to be a teacher so much as an inquirer, or rather inquisitor. He was strictly self-made, self-taught. He sprung from no existing school of philosophy, and he founded none. Some of those who came after him established schools, but he had no such ambition or design. He had neither grove, nor garden, nor porch, nor any other particular place for his discussions, but entered upon them in any place where people would meet him and listen to him. Morning after morning he might be seen in the gymnasium, or the market-house, or the busy mart of the Piræus—wherever people were wont to assemble—among booths, or shops, or ships, or shanties, conversing with any one who came in his way. His place was with men and among them in every vocation and condition of life, content with his poverty, and living, not for himself, but for others.

Some writers have confounded him with the Grecian Sophists, but most improperly, as we think. He was the opposite of the Sophists in almost every respect. They were flippant and boastful; he, modest and humble. They were foppish in their dress and appearance; he was thin and poorly clad.

They exacted large pay for their services; he asked nothing, and would receive nothing, for his. Indeed, it was his favorite employment to encounter them, corner them, and show them up for the amusement of others. The concealed irony of Socrates in his dealings with the Sophists is one of the most interesting features of the contest. On meeting one of these renowned masters of wisdom he affects the profoundest veneration for his genius, and listens for a time to his gorgeous declamation; he then ventures to suggest that some little difficulty occurs to him, which he doubts not that so great a philosopher can easily solve. He begs the privilege of asking two or three simple questions, not at all with the idea of disputing the conclusions so cogently maintained, but merely for his own satisfaction. Overcome by his compliments the Sophist encourages him to propose his doubts, assuring him of an instant and satisfactory solution. The dialogue commences with some very simple query, to which the wiseacre promptly replies. Other questions follow, becoming more and more abstruse, until the Sophist finds himself in difficulty. He has contradicted himself back and forth, and can neither go forward nor turn aside to the right hand or the left. He finds himself in the coils of a great logical *boa-constrictor*, who binds his folds tighter and tighter around him until the poor wretch is nearly strangled, and then, perhaps, he gently releases his folds and suffers his victim to gather breath, but only that he may return to the torture and re-entangle him in the same way.

At a certain time Hippias, a versatile and flippant Sophist, made his appearance at Athens, shining with jewels and tricked out in all the finery of the age. Socrates soon meets him, and accosts him thus: "O Hippias, the fine and the wise, what a long time it is since you last touched Athens!" At which Hippias replies, "It is because I have not had leisure, Socrates, for the Eleans, you know, whenever they have any public affairs to negotiate always apply to me, for they consider me as the ablest person among them to form a right judgment of what is argued, and to make a proper report to them." After such an introduction Socrates persists in plying Hippias with affected praises, just to draw out and expose the coxcomb's vanity, till at length they hit upon the principal topic of discussion, namely, *the beautiful*. "Can you tell me now," says

Socrates, "what is the beautiful?" "No difficulty," replies Hippias; "the easiest thing in the world;" and so he undertakes, time after time, to make out a definition of the beautiful. These definitions the old philosopher sifts and refutes till he makes them appear perfectly ridiculous. Once and again he drives the little Sophist to the wall, pins him there for awhile, and then lets him loose, just to see how he will flounce and flutter. The game is continued until Hippias at length loses all patience. He complains that his argument has been "cut and torn into a thousand pieces," and concludes with gravely advising Socrates to have done with such "petty, paltry disputes," and no longer continue "playing with straws and quibbles." This must suffice as a specimen of Socrates's manner of dealing with the Sophists.

As to the particular doctrines of Socrates it is not easy to speak at length. He wrote nothing himself, and sentiments are ascribed to him in the Dialogues of Plato of which it is likely that he knew nothing. Thus when Socrates heard Plato recite his *Lysis*, he is reported to have said, "How much this young man here imputes to me which I never uttered!"

I have said already that Socrates did not reject the gods and goddesses of his country, but with him these were inferior divinities. Above them all he believed in one Supreme God, the upholder and moral governor of the universe. He held the Deity to be a pure, spiritual, uncreated essence; omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient; who, having instituted the present order of things, pervades and sustains it with an unseen but ceaseless agency. In proof of this he pointed, as Dr. Paley does, to the varied evidences of benevolent design with which what we call the works of nature are every-where fraught. Socrates assigns various reasons why the Deity should be worshipped: (1.) Because, although he is so far above us, he yet thinks of us, feels an interest in us, and manifests in a thousand ways his regard for our happiness. (2.) By the worship of him we may best learn his goodness, care, and love. (3.) We have an instinctive tendency to the adoration of the gods. We cannot be happy and neglect it.

The Greeks in the time of Socrates were generally skeptical as to the immortality of the soul; but this truth he held with a firm conviction. It stood connected in his mind with the

belief of a moral Ruler and Judge, and the necessity of a future retribution. On the ground of a Divine government and providence, of immortality and retribution, Socrates builded his system of morals. They were heathen, and not Christian morals. Tried by the standard of the Gospel, Socrates is wanting; but tried by that of Grecian paganism, he stands forth the moral prodigy of his age. His *theory* of virtue, so far as he had any, was defective—holding knowledge and virtue, also ignorance and vice, to be much the same. Still he urged the practice of virtue in the general, and denounced vice with an energy that might shame many Christian moralists. "If," said he, "we would deserve the favor of the all-seeing Power that delights only in goodness—if we would be happy both here and hereafter—we must live purely, temperately, justly, and seek virtue more than riches, honor, or any other good. We must shun crime more than death, and sacrifice even life to fulfill the will of the gods. The virtuous man alone can meet death with joy; for he cherishes the conviction that he shall not die, but go away to happier abodes. The wicked, on the contrary, cannot console himself even with the hope of annihilation. The terrors of his impending doom already seize upon him. Yet, even aside from an hereafter, virtue is essentially connected with happiness, and vice with misery." Nowhere, except it be in the Christian revelation, are temperance, sobriety, and self-denial enforced by more cogent arguments than in the teachings of Socrates. "He tears off the mask that disguises the deformity of what men call pleasure. He shows her to be a wicked hag, tricked out in the decorations of a harlot—a syren, luring to destruction the inexperienced and unwary—a Circe, whose drugged and poisonous cup transforms men into swine. Drawing them into her service by promises of pleasure she corrupts them in body and soul, and subjects them, after a youth of continued folly, to a manhood of imbecility and remorse—to an old age of shame and despair." The growing degeneracy of the times in which Socrates lived made it necessary for him to insist on topics such as these with the greatest earnestness.

Socrates commenced his public inquiries and exhortations at the age of forty, and continued them for thirty successive years. Considering the sharpness of his logic, and the sternness of his

rebukes, it is no wonder that he had enemies. It is no wonder that there were sophists and sensualists at Athens who hated him and sought his life. The wonder is rather that they bore with him so long. Several years before his death Aristophanes had exposed him to ridicule in his comedy of the Clouds. But in the year 399 before Christ, the last year of his life, he was suddenly arrested on the charge of impiety. His accusers were Melitus, a weak young man, and Anytus and Lyson, whom he is supposed to have offended. The charges against him were the following: "Socrates does not acknowledge the Grecian gods; he has introduced new divinities; he is also chargeable with corrupting the young." He was to be tried before a court consisting of several hundreds, and the penalty proposed was death. Plato expected and attempted to plead his cause, but the judges would not allow him to proceed. Socrates appeared, therefore, in his own defense, and his speech was recorded at the time by Plato, under the title of *The Apology of Socrates*.

The speech of such a man as Socrates when on trial for his life, reported, too, by such a man as Plato, should have much interest on the mere ground of curiosity. It is also a deeply interesting performance both in matter and manner. We find here no splendor of diction, no fervid appeals to the passions, none of the tricks and artifices of oratory; but all is grave, simple, direct, dignified. Socrates addresses his judges much as he was wont to do in common discourse—proposing questions, stating facts, and pressing home upon them his conclusions. He begins by refuting the accusations of his enemies—that he was a mere sophist, whose object it was to pervert the truth, and make the worse appear the better reason; that he was a corrupter of youth, and an innovator upon the religion of his country. He affirms his belief in the Athenian gods, declaring that he not only worships them himself, but endeavors to persuade others, young and old, to do the same. He assures his judges that he is above the fear of death; that he has pursued his particular course of life not with any view to personal emolument, but because he thought it right and just; and that he would be deterred from it by no punishment which they had it in their power to inflict.

After the vote had been taken, and he had been condemned by a majority of three voices, he again addressed his judges

with the same calmness and dignity as before, assuring them that his death would soon be as much regretted as it was now desired, and warned his accusers that a terrible retribution awaited them—that they would come to a speedy and untimely end, which was actually the case.

In the closing part of his address Socrates speaks of his death as a departure to the society of the good in another world, and then asks: "If this be true, O my judges, what greater good can there be than this? At what rate would not either of you purchase a conference with Orpheus and Musæus, with Hesiod and Homer? What would not any one give for an interview with him who led that mighty army against Troy; or with Ulysses, or Sisyphus, or ten thousand others, both male and female, that might be mentioned! for to associate and converse with them would be an inestimable felicity. Truly, I should be willing to die often if these things are true."

After the condemnation of Socrates circumstances occurred which delayed the execution of his sentence some thirty days. During this period he was in prison, where he was often visited by his followers. Among those who came was Crito, his early patron, his oldest and best friend; and this introduces the dialogue of *The Crito*.

Crito came to urge Socrates to make his escape, assuring him that it could easily be done, using many arguments, and promising him all needed pecuniary assistance. Socrates thanks him for his kindness, but utterly refuses to accede to his wishes. He insists that we ought to despise the opinions of the vulgar, endure calamities patiently, and submit to the laws. As we enjoy the benefit of the laws, we ought to consent to bear the burdens, and meet the destiny which they impose. Such is the subject and substance of this dialogue. It is full of noble sentiments, is altogether worthy of the venerable philosopher, and suited to the trying circumstances in which he was placed.

At length Socrates's last day arrived. At the going down of the sun he was to drink the fatal hemlock, and pass away to that other life, of which he had so clear and joyful an anticipation. In the morning of that day he was visited by his wife and children, whose lamentations distressed him, and he directed them to be removed. His philosophic friends now clustered around him, and the day was spent in discussing the most

appropriate and interesting topics. These conversations constitute the dialogue of *The Phædo*.

The great subject of this dialogue is the immortality of the soul. Socrates had often adverted to this subject before, and expressed his belief in it; but he now enters into a demonstration of its truth, and undertakes to free it from objections. As he had not the light of inspiration to guide him, or its voice to instruct him in any way, it may be interesting to know what kind of arguments he would employ in proving the great doctrine of a future life.

1. The first argument which he urges is, that every thing in nature is produced or generated from its *opposite*. Thus the worse proceeds from the better, and the better from the worse. From the state of wakefulness we pass to sleep, and from sleep to wakefulness. And as from being alive we go to the dead, so from the dead we pass into another life.

2. The soul must subsist after death, because it existed *prior to the present life*. Socrates here assumes the soul's pre-existence, and infers its continued existence when the body is dead.

3. The soul will exist forever, because it is a *simple, unchanging substance*. If it were a compound, like the body, it must, like the body, be dissolved. But as it is one simple substance, and not subject to mutations like the body, the conclusion is that it will never be dissolved.

4. It belongs to the soul to govern the body, and not the body the soul; which proves that the soul is allied to divinity, and, like that, is immortal.

5. Into whatever the soul enters it introduces *life*, which shows that life is essential to it, and it can never die.

Socrates not only urges these arguments at length, and with a great variety of illustration, but he listens patiently to the objections of his friends, and obviates them to their satisfaction, thus preparing himself and them in the best manner for the solemn event which was so soon to separate him from them.

A little before sunset he went into the bath, saying that he preferred to wash himself before drinking the poison, rather than trouble the women to wash his dead body. His friend Crito asked him how he would be buried. "Just as you please,"

said he, "that is, if you can catch me;" at the same time remarking with a smile, "Crito thinks that *I* am he whom he will shortly see dead; whereas *I, Socrates*, shall then have departed to the joys of the blessed."

When the executioner came to administer the poison, he was so overcome with the calmness and fortitude of his victim that he could not restrain his tears. And when his friends, the philosophers, saw him actually drinking it, they were quite overwhelmed. They covered their faces with their mantles, and some of them wept aloud. But Socrates rebuked them, saying: "What are you doing, excellent men! 'I sent away the women lest they should produce a disturbance of this nature. Is it not proper to die joyfully, and with propitious omens? Be quiet, therefore, and restrain your tears.'" When the poison began to take effect, he laid himself down upon his couch, and closed his eyes. At length, opening them, he said, "Crito, we owe a cock to *Æsculapius*. Discharge this debt for me, and do not neglect it." These were his last words. The great soul of Socrates was soon released, and naught remained but his lifeless and (as he deemed it) comparatively worthless body.

The grand source of that consolation which he felt in the dying hour Socrates repeatedly explained. "Unless I thought," said he, "that I should depart to other gods who are wise and good, and to the society of men who have gone from this life, and are better now than when among us, I might well be troubled at death; but now I believe assuredly that I shall go to the gods, who are perfectly good; and I hope also to dwell with wise and good men. So that I cannot be afflicted at the thought of dying, believing that death is not the end of us; and that it will be much better hereafter for the good than the evil."

We cannot conclude this account of Socrates without instituting a comparison—often forced upon us—between his life and death and that of our blessed Lord. Both were moral and religious teachers, and both claimed to be acting under a divine commission. Both were surrounded by a company of attached followers; and though neither of them wrote any thing themselves, but threw out their words upon the winds, the lives and sayings of both were recorded by their friends.

Those of Socrates were committed to writing by Plato and Xenophon, and those of Jesus by the four evangelists. And to carry the analogy a little further, both these great personages had mortal enemies, and both came to a violent death. Socrates was condemned to drink the fatal hemlock, and Jesus to suffer on the cross. In one respect there was a difference between them. Socrates was born and trained at Athens, in the very focus of ancient philosophy and wisdom; while Jesus had his training under poor parents, at Nazareth—one of the meanest towns in the most inconsiderable province of Palestine. In point of local position and advantages the case was decidedly in favor of Socrates. And yet what were the results of his teaching and labors compared with those of Jesus Christ? Though considerable for a time, as we have seen, yet in the long run they were as nothing. How few have troubled themselves about Socrates and his philosophy for the last thousand years! How very few have ever heard of it, or know any thing about it! But the teachings and the life of Jesus are as household words in every part of the civilized world. Little children, as soon as they can say any thing, are taught to lisp the name of Jesus, and to reverence him as their Saviour. In numberless Sabbath-schools and Christian congregations the teachings of Jesus are unfolded every Lord's day, and his name is fragrant as ointment poured forth.

Such, then, is the mighty difference in the results of these men's teachings; and how is it to be accounted for? How? In only one way. Socrates, though an earnest inquirer after truth, was—what he professed to be—a frail, ignorant mortal, groping after truth, but scarcely able to find it or to be assured of it when it was found. Jesus was—what he professed to be—"the Light of the world;" not only the Son of man, but the Son of God. It was well said by the eloquent blind preacher, (quoting it from Rousseau,) "Socrates died like a philosopher, but Jesus Christ like a God." With equal truth it may be said: Socrates lived and taught like a philosopher, but Jesus Christ like a messenger from heaven—one "who is over all, God blessed forever." On this supposition the widely differing results of the teachings of these two men may be fully accounted for, but on no other. On any other theory the facts of the case are an inexplicable enigma.

ART. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, July, 1871. (New York.)—1. Darwin's Theory of the Origin of Species. 2. Reminiscences of James P. Wilson, D.D., and Rev. Albert Barnes. 3. The Revival of Christian Dogmatics. 4. Retributive Law and Capital Punishment. 5. Physical-life Theories and Religious Thought. 6. Albert Barnes. 7. President Wheelock and Dr. Chauncy. 8. The General Assembly and Ministerial Relief.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1871. (Philadelphia.)—1. New Testament Revision. 2. Athens: Her Place in History. 3. Lightfoot's Christian Ministry. 4. The Baptist Historical Society. 5. The National Baptist Educational Convention. 6. Life and Times of Rev. John Leland.

July, 1871. (Philadelphia.)—1. Romish and Protestant Theory of Missions. 2. The Bible and the State. 3. A Study in Chinese Literature. 4. The Abrahamic Covenants. 5. The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. 6. Instability of the Pastoral Relation.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1871. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels. Second Paper. 2. Does the New Testament Idea of a Local Church admit of its being composed of Several Congregations? 3. Disciples and Baptists—Will They Unite. 4. Classic Baptism. Second Paper. 5. Miracles and Modern Skepticism.

MERCERSBURGH REVIEW, July, 1871. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Revelation of God in Christ. 2. The Fourfold Culture of Man. 3. St. Paul the Corypheus of Evangelical Progress. 4. Restoration and Conversion of the Jews. 5. Scripture View of Holy Baptism. 6. Glory and Honor. 7. The Miracle of Pentecost in relation to the Constitution of the Church.

NEW ENGLANDER, July, 1871. (New Haven.)—1. The Opening of the New Northwest. 2. Tai-Ping-Wang, and the Chinese Rebellion of 1853-1862. 3. Life in the Roman Catholic Church during the first French Revolution, as illustrated by the Memoirs of the Marquise de Montagu. 4. Evolutionism in Natural History as related to Christianity. 5. Mirabeau as a Statesman, in the Light of the History of France during the last Eighty Years. 6. Yale College—Some Thoughts Respecting its Future. Fourth Article.

QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1871. (Gettysburgh.)—1. France and the Allied Powers at Waterloo. 2. Strange Fire Worshipers. 3. The Spirit of the Age. 4. Education, its Aims and Results. 5. The Pulpit. 6. The German Empire. 7. Church-Love among our People. 8. Female Education.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, A CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1871. (T. C. BLAKE, D.D., Editor, Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Language and its Uses. 2. The Sojourn in Egypt. 3. The "Eternal Now." 4. Practical Theology. 5. The Abrahamic Covenant. 6. The Power of the Cross. 7. Faith. 8. "The Plymouth Pulpit." 9. Mutability of Moral Distinctions. 10. The Church—Its Strength.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, April, 1871. (Boston.)—1. Dr. Williamson's Rudiments. 2. Biographical Sketches—Edward Turner. 3. Dr. Patton on Universalism. 4. Mystery and Religion. 5. John Murray.

July, 1871. (Boston.)—1. Biographical Sketches. 2. Dr. Williamson and his Reviewer. 3. Recent Explorations in Palestine. 4. History of the Devil.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1871. (London.)—1. The Buddhist Revolution in India. 2. Discussions on the Doctrine of the Divine Wrath. 3. The Modern Reformers of the Roman Catholic Church. 4. On the Origin of Primitive Sacrifice. 5. The Progress of Biblical Archaeology. 6. German Catholics in Conflict with Rome. 7. Non-self-consciousness. *Reprinted Article: Calvinism in the English Reformation.*

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1871. (London.)—1. The Roman Empire. 2. Theism: Desiderata in the Theistic Argument. 3. Hugh Miller. 4. Hereditary Legislators. 5. The Genius of Non-conformity and the Progress of Society. 6. The Dialogues of Plato. 7. Mr. Miall's Motion on Disestablishment.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1871. (London.)—1. The Heresies of Science. 2. Birmingham Skepticism. 3. Subterranean Rome. 4. The Civil Service. 5. American Newspapers. 6. The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland. 7. Hugh Miller's Life and Letters. 8. Julius Müller on the Incarnation.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Shakspeare. 2. Darwin's Descent of Man. 3. Austria since Sadowa. 4. Jeremy Taylor. 5. Music: its Origin and Influence. 6. Maine's Village Communities. 7. Alexander Dumas. 8. Economic Fallacies and Labor Utopias. 9. The New School Boards.

We postpone to our next *Quarterly* our notice of the second article of this Review.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1871. (New York: Reprint—Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Military Policy of Russia. 2. O'Flanagan's Lives of the Irish Chancellors. 3. Swinburne's Poems. 4. Burton's History of Scotland. 5. The Vatican Council. 6. Suppressed and Censured Books. 7. Darwin on the Descent of Man. 8. Scandinavian Politics. 9. Communal France.

Article Seventh, after describing the popularity of Darwin's works, the rare ability and candor of the man, and the fearful moral revolution which his animal anthropology is sure to create in the world, defends the divine origin of man on the evolution doctrine of Mivart and the traits of divine design traced in man by Wallace. Mivart, as our readers will recollect, differs from Darwin in maintaining the derivation of species from species, not purely by infinitesimal changes, but by jumps. Our Review maintains that such jump in man's derivation is well shown by Wallace to be not purely fortuitous, but according to underlying law and divine design. He does not say that Adam may have been thus evolved, for, after all, he allows, apparently, an immensely larger than the Mosaic antiquity of the race, or rather races, of man.

The argument for the genetic derivation of races we give at some length:

"It is universally admitted that man, in his purely physical nature, is closely linked with the brutes. His body is subject to the same laws of reproduction, growth, decay, and death as theirs, and is built essentially on the same plan. Each muscle,

nerve, blood-vessel, and bone is represented, more or less, in the bodies of the higher mammals, and especially among the anthropomorphous apes. Besides these obvious points of resemblance there are others equally striking. Man is liable to certain of the same diseases as the brutes, such as hydrophobia, variola, and glanders, a fact which 'proves the close similarity of their tissues and blood, both in minute structure and composition, far more plainly than does their comparison under the best microscope, or by the aid of the best chemical analysis.'* Our embryonic development also differs in no respect from that of the higher mammals, and is scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from that of the dog or the ape. It is useless for any man to shut his eyes to the full weight of this identity of structure.

"The evidence afforded by rudimentary organs tends also in the same direction. The panniculus carnosus muscle, for instance, by which horses move and twitch their skin, is found in an efficient state in the human forehead and neck, while it is very generally not traceable in the other parts of the body. Some people, however, have the power of moving the scalp, very much as the lower animals, and of setting in motion the muscles of the ear. This probably is an instance of the loss of an organ by disuse. The small vermiform appendage to the human caecum is a rudiment of that which is long and convoluted in the orang and enormous in the marsupials. The small point also on the inner margin of the outer fold of the ear, which Mr. Woolner first detected when at work at his figure of Puck, is alleged to be the last lingering trace of a pointed ear, as in some of the baboons, and many other animals. Many other cases might be adduced of the same kind.

"The variations also traceable in the human frame point in the direction of the lower animals. In one case, quoted by Professor Houghton, the arrangement of tendons of thumb and fingers characteristic of the macaque was fully shown in the human hand; and Mr. Wood, in a series of papers contributed to the Royal Society, has minutely described a number of muscular variations in man, which represent normal structures in the lower animals. In one male subject no less than seven such variations were observed, all of which plainly represented the muscles of certain kinds of apes. Mr. Wood considers that

* Darwin's "Descent of Man," vol. i, p. 11.

these variations 'must be taken to indicate some unknown factor, of much importance to a comprehensive knowledge of general and scientific anatomy.' Mr. Darwin argues that this unknown factor is most probably the tendency to revert to a former state of existence: 'It is quite incredible that a man should through mere accident abnormally resemble, in no less than seven of his muscles, certain apes, if there had been no genetic connection between them. On the other hand, if man is descended from some ape-like creature, no valid reason can be assigned why certain muscles should not suddenly reappear after an interval of many thousand generations, in the same manner as, with horses, asses, and mules, dark-colored stripes suddenly reappear on the legs and shoulders, after an interval of hundreds, or more probably thousands, of generations.'—Vol. i, p. 129.

"Hence it is contended that the identity of the structure of man's body with that of the brutes cannot be accounted for by the ordinary doctrine of special creation, or the creation of species directly and immediately out of nothing, which is itself hedged in with insuperable difficulties in general application. It does not explain the variations in the direction of the lower animals, nor the rudimentary organs, nor the embryological development. Nor does it afford any clue to the law of geological succession. It does not tell us why the existing group of marsupials in Australia should have been represented in the quaternary age by allied species in that region; or why the armadillos and sloths of South America should find their nearest allies in those species which immediately preceded them in that area; or why, in the Old World, the Asiatic elephant should be so closely allied to the mammoth."

On this the unscientific mind (stupidly inveterate, and adhering to the old notion of, not "special," but general, though direct divine creation or creations) would beg to offer some queries. We adhere, provisionally, to the old Augustinian doctrine that the whole scheme or programme of life, as developed historically into existence, exists in the divine mind as a unit, yet as successively unfolding and ascending by analogies and lines of typical law. Ideally, the whole animal genus is created at once, in due symmetry as a whole. Such typical law does exist; for hereditary, genetic uniformity is regulated and shaped

by it. Why the law cannot exist without the genetic derivation is not clear. And we are not sure that the various similarities of reproduction, growth, diseases, anticipation in the lower species of the higher, and reversions, more or less abnormal, of the higher to the lower, may not be explained by successive creations, through geologic ages, generally ascending, and unfolding under typic law.

That the operations of laws, whether of nature or of God, are modified by the subjects they meet with—that law crosses law, so that compromises between them take place in the result—are facts of which the progress of things is made up. Monstrosities and miscarriages in birth, to which atheism so foolishly objects, are but instances of the operations of one law crossing those of another law. Even in revelation miracle compromises with and adjusts to the natural conditions. Adam was corporeally created not out of an essence drawn from the highest heavens, but from the red dust of his geographical section. What wonder, then, that the series of animals arising under divine law, adjusting to local conditions, should in particular geographical sections conform approximately to particular types. The natural conditions, when analyzed and defined by science, if they ever shall be, will not thereby contradict the law.

And this view seems corroborated by geology. *Successive creations* are written upon its pages. Races in full myriad spring up at their due epoch. Man himself appears on earth a perfect man. The earliest known human skull might have carried the brains of a philosopher. This contradicts and utterly annihilates Darwinism, and cannot be explained by purely naturalistic Mivartism. Both Mivart and Wallace claim an exceptional divine design in man. But in their scheme it is an anomaly, a mere exception, without admitting honestly and frankly what it needs but upright manhood to assert, that *there is a divine habit, method, and law of miracle, under which man's creation comes*. Our Reviewer, like Mivart and Wallace, writes under some timidity before the bold front and dictatorial talk of the temporary naturalism of the day.

Mivartism is used by our Reviewer to explain the diversity of human races. It might be used by a commentator to show how Ham was parent of the Negroids. He adopts the Huxleyan division into four races, Australoid, Negroid, Mongoloid, and Xanthro-

chroic, the last about equivalent to "Caucasian." Of these the last named appears latest in point of time. He believes that the distribution of races is largely explained by great geologic changes. The results of the Reviewer's discussion singularly coincide with Dr. M'Causland's theory, noticed in a former "Quarterly," of a plurality of races of unknown antiquity but a Mosaic Adam, the progenitor of the Caucasian race.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1871. (New York: Reprint. Leonard Scott, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Religious Life and Tendencies in Scotland. 2. The Poetry of Democracy, by Walt Whitman. 3. The Genesis of the Free Will Doctrine. 4. Abeillard. 5. The Republicans of the Commonwealth. 6. Army Organization. 7. Early English Literature. 8. The Government and the Liberal Party. 9. The Function of Physical Pain. Anæsthetics. 10. On the Method of Political Economy.

If our reader should pick up the following rigmarole near the window of a lunatic asylum would he think it too good to be the production of the crazed brain of one of the inmates?

"I conn'd old times; I sat studying at the feet of the great masters: now, if eligible, O that the great masters might return and study me! In the name of these States, shall I scorn the antique? Why, these are the children of the antique, to justify it. Dead poets, philosophers, priests, martyrs, artists, inventors, governments long since, language-shapers on other shores, nations once powerful, now reduced, withdrawn or desolate, I dare not proceed till I respectfully credit what you have left, wafted hither: I have perused it, own it is admirable, (moving awhile among it;) think nothing can ever be greater, nothing can ever deserve more than it deserves; regarding it all intently a long while, then dismissing it, I stand in my place, with my own day, here."

Yet it is quoted with admiration as a specimen extract by the Westminster, from the "Poet of Democracy, Walt Whitman." Undoubtedly there are some sorts of "democracy" in this country of which this smutty genius is the proper type, and the Westminster may be his proper trumpeter. But when in this connection the term "democracy" is used as the designation of our national character we would respectfully demur. Or if Walt Whitman must be our representative poet, we suggest that in the same company Philo T. Barnum be our representative *savant* and George Francis Train our national orator.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1871. Fourth Number.—*Essays*: 1. SCHLOTTMAN, The Moabite king, Mesha. 2. BEY-SCHLAG, The Opponents of Paul in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.—*Thoughts and Remarks*: 1. SCHRADER, The Assyrian List of Administration. 2. OPPERT, Shalmaneser and Sargon. 3. VAHINGES, The Support of the Israelites in the Desert. 4. MOLLER, Juan Valdez Once More.—*Reviews*: DILTHEY, Life of Schleiermacher, Reviewed by NITZSCH. 2. SCHUTZE, Evangelical Pedagogics, Reviewed by DUSTERDICK. 3. KUBEL, The Social and Economical Legislation of the Old Testament, Reviewed by RIEHM.

The work by Professor Schlottman of Halle on the famous inscription of Mesa (*Die Siegessäule des Mesa*. Halle, 1871) has already been mentioned in a former number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review." The work attracted great attention in England, and an English translation was arranged, for which the author specially prepared an essay on the history of King Mesa, with particular reference to the biblical accounts. As the publication of the English edition has been delayed, Schlottmann gives his essay in the above article. In an interesting introduction he reviews the history of the inscription and of the ample literature concerning it. The memorial stone of Mesa, as we learn from this introduction, was discovered by the Alsatian missionary, Klein, during a missionary journey in 1868, upon the ruins of Dibon, north of Arnon. The Frenchmen who published the inscription in February, 1870, for the first time, wholly concealed the name of the discoverer, whose merit, on the contrary, was distinctly recognized by English scholars in several articles in the "Times" and the "Athenæum." Both papers called Klein a German, and even a Prussian. In consequence of several unfortunate circumstances the stone was destroyed by a tribe of Bedouins. (A full account of this destruction is given by the German Consul, H. Petermann, in Jerusalem, in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenland. Gesellschaft*, vol. xxiv, pp. 640-644, and by Dr. Ginsburg in his work, "The Moabite Stone," p. 9, *et seq.*) Fortunately Ganneau, the Chancellor of the French Consulate in Jerusalem, had procured from several Arabs a *fac-simile* of the whole inscription, by which alone, in spite of its partial imperfection, the understanding of the whole connection is made possible. Subsequently Ganneau gained possession of numerous fragments of the stone, in particular of two large pieces. The energy exhibited by him in securing possession of the fragments, as well

as the skill displayed in the deciphering, are generally recognized. According to the *fac-simile*, transcription, and translation of Ganneau, the inscription was for the first time published February, 1870, by the distinguished Oriental scholar, Count Vogüé. Further corrections, a more distinct transcription of parts of the text, and new deciphering of several previously illegible passages, were given by Ganneau in the March and June numbers of the *Revue Archeologique*. The former number also gave an improved *fac-simile*. In June Count Vogüé also published a new translation, together with a commentary by Ganneau; also a once more improved edition of the *fac-simile*. These French publications soon called forth a considerable number of works from the German Orientalists, most of which have been mentioned in former numbers of the "Methodist Quarterly Review." According to the first (inaccurate) description by Ganneau the stone was rounded on the top, but at the bottom angular, and as broad as thick, and Count Vogüé, therefore, as well as Schlottman, called it a "triumphal column." A more accurate description has subsequently been given in a letter of the first discoverer, Klein, who saw the stone in its uninjured condition. According to him it was rounded at the bottom as well as at the top, and its three dimensions were 113, 70, and 35 centimeters. It was, therefore, a tablet rather than a column, and the "triumphal monument," or "triumphal inscription, of Mesha," would be a more appropriate name for it. Among the more important German publications are those by Nöldeke and Hitzig, the former of whom arrives at nearly the same results as Schlottmann. The author concludes his interesting article by the following remarks:

"We believe we have by our article shed a new light on the importance of the Moabite monument. It awakens a just desire for further discoveries of the same kind. For, more than probably any other inscription of so small a size and in so imperfect a state of preservation, it has furnished important new material to various departments of science. With a tribe which justly has been designated as half nomadic, a document is found which, even from a literary point of view, betrays a high degree of culture. In a country in which such a document could be written, much has certainly been written. The same may be supposed with regard to the kindred tribes of Ammon

and Edom. And while it may have appeared probable that among the ancient Hebrews monumental stone inscriptions had been in no, or at least very little, use, the monument of Mesha makes us believe in the existence of royal inscriptions among the Hebrews. We do not wish, however, to raise hereby sanguine hopes. The inscription of the Sidonian king, Eshmunazar, which was discovered in 1855, thus far remains isolated in the province of Phœnician antiquity; and none of the monuments since discovered can be compared with it in point of size or importance. Little, it is true, has been done to bring to light other relics of Phœnician literature, except by the expedition undertaken by Renan at the expense of the French Government. The Moabite discovery, which opens the prospect of much greater literary gains than the Phœnician, should give a new impulse to the literary exploration of the ruins of Palestine."

The above mentioned inscription of Eshmunazar of the Sidonians, is, besides the inscription of Mesha, the only literary document of considerable size in the "Canaanite language" of the tribes neighboring to Israel which is thus far known to us. It is also of great interest for the student of the Old Testament, who will find a full elucidation of it in a work by Professor Schlottmann, entitled *Die Inschrift Eschmunazars*, (Halle, 1868.)

The article of Schlottmann is only one of the many interesting essays in this number of the *Studien*. In fact, this venerable veteran among the German *Quarterlies* has, during the past two years, rejuvenated to a remarkable degree, and is at present more replete with valuable information than at any previous period of its history. Never before did it count abler scholars among its contributors. It devotes special attention to the important discoveries which scientific expeditions for many years have been bringing to light in Western Asia, and to harmonizing their results with the biblical accounts. It must be of the deepest interest to every student of the Old Testament to see the remarkable agreement between the new documents and the biblical accounts which were written two thousand years ago. The two essays in the above number by Professor Schrader and Prof. Oppert both refer to the history of the Assyrian kings who were so closely connected with the history of the Hebrews, and in particular—the one wholly, the

other partly—to the two kings Shalmaneser and Sargon. We give a few extracts from the article of Prof. Oppert, who has taken so prominent a part in the discovery of the Assyrian antiquities and in their deciphering. He says: "Six kings of the new Assyrian empire are mentioned in the writings of the Old Testament, Pul, Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, Sennacherib, and Esar-haddon. Of these Esar-haddon and Sargon are only mentioned occasionally; of Sargon it was only known that a prophecy of Isaiah was dated from the year of the capture of Ashdod by Sargon, (Isa. xx, 1.) It was different with Shalmaneser. To him was given to besiege the capital, Samaria, and, as was inferred from 2 Kings xvii, 6, xviii, 11, to capture it, and thus to put an end to the kingdom of the ten tribes. Before the discovery of Nineveh no one thought of identifying the prominent Shalmaneser with Sargon, of whom otherwise nothing whatever was known. According to the biblical accounts which mention (2 Kings xviii, 13) Sennacherib as being king of Assyria in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, Sargon could have reigned only a very short time, if his reign fell between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. The discovery of Khorsabad gave to the hitherto unknown Sargon a much greater importance. De Longpérier was the first to recognize in 1847 that Sargon must have been the founder of Khorsabad; the triumphal column which was transported from Cyprus to Berlin evidently belonged to this king, who in no less than six documents speaks of the fifteenth year of his reign. De Sauley, and subsequently Hincks and Rawlinson, showed that Sargon, in all his inscriptions, ascribes to himself the capture of Samaria. To harmonize this discovery with the traditional interpretation of the biblical passages quoted above several respectable scholars assumed that Shalmaneser and Sargon were the same person. They adduced in favor of their opinion that it was proved by Assyrian texts that Sargon was the father of Sennacherib, while the apocryphal book of Tobit called Sennacherib a son of Enemeser, which of course is taken as a mutilation of Shalmaneser. It was not taken into consideration that whenever the Bible uses two foreign names for one individual it expressly states the identification, (Esth. ii, 7: 'And he brought up Hadassah, that is, Esther;') also, that Sargon never calls

himself Shalmaneser. The cuneiform inscriptions make an identification of Shalmaneser and Sargon absolutely impossible."

From the great annals of Khorsabad it is clear that Sargon took Samaria in the first month of the first year of his reign. As the Bible distinctly says in several places that the siege of Samaria lasted three years, and that it was begun by Shalmaneser, it is impossible that Sargon could commence it, and that he was the same person with Shalmaneser, if the Assyrian and the Bible accounts were to be regarded as equally correct. But, says Oppert, the Bible nowhere asserts that Samaria was taken by Shalmaneser. In 2 Kings xviii, 9, it is stated that "Shalmaneser came up against Samaria and besieged it," and in the following verse that "at the end of three years *they* (not Shalmaneser, but the Assyrians) took it." In chapter xvii, 5, 6, it is only said, *without mentioning names*, that the King of Assyria went up to Samaria and besieged it three years, and that in the ninth year of Hosea the King of Assyria took Samaria. Another argument adduced by those maintaining the identity of the two names is the alleged fact that there are so many Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon and none of Shalmaneser; but Oppert replies that in the first place no valid proof against the existence of an Assyrian king can possibly be based on the fact that *thus far* no inscriptions of his have been discovered, and that, in the second place, Rawlinson several years ago really found the name of Shalmaneser on an Assyrian inscription, and that he (Oppert) himself has verified it. After having entered more fully into the details of the history of the two Assyrian kings Oppert constructs the following brief outline of their history as a harmonization of the Assyrian and the biblical accounts. Shalmaneser VI. was the successor of Tiglath-pileser. The latter had shaken off the yoke of the Chaldean, Pul and his successors, and ascended the throne in 745 B. C. Whether he was the father of Shalmaneser is not known. The brief reign of Shalmaneser is exclusively known from the Bible and a fragment of Menander in Josephus. From the latter source it appears that the Assyrian king invaded Phœnicia and besieged Tyre, because the Tyrians had again subjected the rebellious Cittians. With the exception of the insular city of Tyre every thing was conquered by Shalmaneser; in particular Sidon, Akko, and Old Tyre;

all Phœnicia armed sixty vessels against this one city, but was conquered by twelve Tyrian vessels. The king cut off all aqueducts, and for five years the Tyrians had to content themselves with well-water; evidently until the capture of Tyre by Sargon, of which the fragment of Menander does not speak. During this time began, in 724, the siege of Samaria, the end of which Shalmaneser was not to see. He died in the course of the year 722, and after an interval of several months an aged descendant of the formal royal house seized the throne, probably in consequence of an election. Sarkinarku, born about 730, was nearly seventy years old when he placed the crown on his head. Immediately after ascending the throne he marched westward to conquer Samaria. He took the city and carried twenty-seven thousand men into captivity. Having returned to Phœnicia, he conquered, in 720, Hamath and Northern Syria, in 719 Tyre, and defeated the Ethiopian Jabako near Raphia. During the following years the king, who in the meanwhile had assumed the name Sarkayan, (the Assyrian form from which the Hebrew Sargon has been taken,) was engaged in the Northern countries and in the East; he received the tribute of Egypt and Arabia, but did not return to Phœnicia until 711, having been recalled by the rebellious Ashdod. He besieged the city, took it after a long siege, and then hastened back to Assyria to meet the threatening Mero-dach-baladan of Babylonia. Not until the beginning of the year 709 he entered the Holy City, from which the king had escaped, and the whole year had to be spent in warring against the Babylonian in Chaldæa. Henceforth Sargon himself appears no longer to have gone to war. His generals subjected Elam, crossed over to Cyprus, and settled disputes concerning the throne in the Median Ellis. After five years the Babylonians once more revolted, probably a short time before the death of Sargon, who when over eighty years old was assassinated, leaving to his son Sennacherib his throne and far-reaching plans. The time after his withdrawal from the war Sargon devoted to the establishment of a new royal city, which was to replace Nineveh, and which, with a magnificent palace, rose north-east of the old capital, on the foot of the mountains. But the new residence, Dur-Sarkayan, was not to survive for a long time the death of its founder. The son rebuilt the venerable palace in

Nineveh. Xenophon and his companions saw the new royal city only as the ruins of Mespila, and to-day the new Persian name of "the city of bears," Khorsabad, no longer recalls the name of Sargon. Thus the mighty figure of the warlike, just, and hoary Sargon parts distinctly from that of the less fortunate Shalmaneser VI., to whom it was not given to conclude by his race the long series of the kings of Assyria.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (*Journal for Historical Theology.*)

1. KRUMMEL, Utraquists and Taborites. A Contribution to the History of the Bohemian Reformation in the Fifteenth Century. 2. RONSCH, Contributions to a History of the Old Latin Translations of the Bible.

The first article gives the concluding chapters of the very valuable essay of Krummel on the history of the Utraquists and Taborites, namely, Chap. vi: "The Reaction; the Return of the Emperor Sigismund to Bohemia. The Attempt of a General Restoration of Catholicism in Bohemia, 1436-1437." Chap. vii: "The Results of the whole Hussite Movement; the Utraquist Church, the Entire Disappearance of the Taborites, and the Origin of the elder Society of Brethren." The essay will undoubtedly be published in book form, and will be on all sides welcomed as a great enrichment of the literature of the Hussites.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH.—The movement of the Catholic opponents of Papal infallibility in Germany, or, as they now call themselves, the Old Catholics, has during the last three months assumed so large dimensions that it is now commonly looked upon as the most important religious movement of the age. It is believed not to be exposed to the same danger of comparative failure as the German Catholic Church inaugurated by Ronge in 1845, for while then not one Catholic theologian of literary reputation identified himself with the movement, now the men whom the bishops themselves have honored, and even consulted as the greatest scholars of the Church, take the lead. The bishops appear to recognize the full extent of the danger. They treat as excommunicated every one who in any way expresses his sympathy with the reform; they refuse him admission to any of the sacraments, and a burial in accordance with the rites of the Church if he dies. The Bishop of Passau has gone so far as to pronounce excommunication over every one who will read a newspaper of his episcopal city which supports the movement. Many have been scared, by the threatening attitude of the Bishops, into submission.

Of the priests, in particular, who were known to oppose the doctrine of infallibility, the vast majority have bowed down in view of the probability that they would lose, by an announcement of their conviction, their living. But already there is a strong body of men scattered over all parts of Germany, and represented in nearly every town, who are fully determined to hold out and to enter the organization of the Old Catholic Church, which will exclude all, be they pope, bishops, priests, or laymen, who adhere to the heresy of infallibility, and claim those Catholics who remain as the only true Catholic Church.

The great task the leaders have to accomplish is to hasten a full and perfect organization, so that every Catholic who sides with them may feel conscious that he rests in the bosom of a Church. Several important steps have been taken in this direction. A number of prominent men met at Munich on May 29, under the presidency of Döllinger, and prepared a declaration of principles, which, as the provisional doctrinal standard of the new ecclesiastical body, attracted, of course, general attention. The main points of the declaration, which is undoubtedly from the pen of Döllinger, are: 1. The Old Catholics persist in rejecting the Vatican infallibility and the Vatican doctrines which, notwithstanding the denial of the Bishops, concede to the Pope personal infallibility and absolute power in the Church. 2. We adhere to the conviction that the Vatican decrees are a serious danger to the State and society, and are utterly irreconcilable with the laws and institutions of the present States. 3. The German Bishops, by interpreting the Vatican doctrines in the most contradictory manner, show that they are well aware of their novelty, and are ashamed of them. 4. The Old Catholics repel the threats of the Bishops as uncalled for, and their compulsory measures as invalid. By the episcopal excommunications the faithful cannot forfeit their right to partake of the means of grace, nor the priests their right to administer them. 5. The Old Catholics indulge the hope that under the guidance of Providence the conflict now begun will prepare and ultimately bring on the long desired and inevitable reform of the constitution and the life of the Church. We hope for a genuine regeneration of the Church, in which every civilized Catholic nation will constitute, in accordance with its peculiar character and mission, a free member of the body of the Church universal, in which the clergy and laity will harmoniously co-operate for developing the life of the Church, and in which a thoroughly educated episcopacy and primacy will again secure to the Church her place at the head of the civilization of the world. The declaration is signed by thirty-one names; among them Professors Döllinger, Friedrich, Huber, Cornelius, Haushofer, Berchtold of the University of Munich, Professor Reinkens of the University of Breslau, Professor Knoedt of the University of Bonn, Professor Shulte of the University of Prague, Professor Michelis of Braunsberg, Count Moy of Munich, Lord Acton Dalberg, member of the English House of Lords, Sir Blenner-Hassett, of England. The declaration was made public in June, and soon received from Rome the emphatic assent of Father Hyacinthe.

The organization of the Church is to be effected in a Catholic Congress, which is to be held at Munich on Sept. 22, 23, and 24, and is to be attended by delegates from all Catholic countries of Europe. This Congress may have a decisive influence on the fate of the whole movement; if it fails to do its allotted work, and give to the dissatisfied Catholics a new Church, the confidence in the whole movement may be shaken. On Aug. 5 a preliminary Congress, consisting of forty prominent representatives of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, met at Heidelberg, to discuss the programme of the Munich Congress, which had been drawn up by Professor Huber. They found themselves in full accord on all important points, but confined themselves strictly to resolutions concerning the organization of the coming Congress.

The secular governments of Europe still continue in a waiting attitude. Professor Schulte of Prague, who before 1870 was generally praised by the Catholic press as the greatest living writer on the Church law, and who is now one of the leading champions of the Old Catholics, again insists, in a work just published, that the governments of the countries in which the Catholic Church bears the character of the State Church are bound to recognize the Old Catholics as the only true Catholic Church, and to protect them in the possession of all the rights and all the property belonging to the Catholic Church. This length hardly any government will have the courage to go. Only in Switzerland the cantonal Government of Aargau has forbidden the teaching of the new doctrine in the Catholic schools, and withholds the salary from every teacher who can be proved to have taught it. The Prussian ministry has likewise made an important decision. The Bishop of Ermeland had excommunicated Dr. Woltmann, of the Gymnasium of Braunsberg, as an "Old Catholic," and requested the Government to appoint an orthodox professor for instruction in the Catholic religion. The Government declined, on the ground that the State had nothing to do with the troubles inside the Catholic Church, and continued to regard both parties as Catholics. The Bishop then forbade all Catholic students to attend the instruction of Dr. Woltmann, to which the Government replied by excluding from the institution all the students obeying the episcopal order. In September a meeting of the German Bishops was held at Fulda, to concert a plan of action in their conflict with the Governments. In Bavaria a new ministry has been constituted, which is known to be decidedly opposed to the Ultramontanes. A pastor who with a large portion of his congregation has seceded from Rome is sustained by the ministry in the possession of the Church. A new minister has been sent to Rome who is regarded as an enthusiastic adherent of Döllinger, and so are a majority of the statesmen and the high officers of the kingdom. In Austria the Emperor has written a letter to the Hungarian Bishops disapproving of the course taken by them in promulgating the decrees of the Vatican Council, including that on Papal Infallibility; and the cable says, that one Bishop at least has since declared that he wishes the promulgation of the Vatican Council to be regarded as null and void. The number of Catholics in Austria who take an active part in

the Old Catholic movement is very large, apparently larger than in any other country.

The Oriental and the Anglican Churches continue to show a special interest in the movement. It is felt that the efforts which have for many years been made to draw all the Churches claiming to have bishops of apostolical succession into a closer union could not be promoted more efficiently than by the success of the Old Catholics. Not only might the champions of this movement thus see bishops in sympathy with the union movement in every country of the Christian world, but Old Catholic bishops would constitute a most available link of connection, as both High Church Anglican and Oriental bishops might find it easier to arrive at a full understanding with them than among each other. The leaders of the movement, and in particular Dr. Döllinger, are therefore the recipients of marked attentions and honors on the part of these two denominations. Thus the University of Oxford has conferred upon him the title of LL.D., with a most flattering recognition of his literary distinction; and on the part of the Greek Church a Russian Abbot, the special delegate of the Archbishop of Kieff, has for some time been staying with Döllinger, in order, as his instruction says, "to obtain a better insight into the essence and the aims of the Catholic resistance to the papal innovations." Under these circumstances the next developments of the Old Catholic movement will be expected with intense interest.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

AMONG the most important theological works published in Germany during the past year belongs that of Prof. A. Ritschl, on the "Christian Doctrine of Justification and Atonement," (*Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste*. Vol. I. Bonn, 1870.) The author, by his first work on the origin of the old Catholic Church, which was partly pervaded by the views of the Tübingen school, gained for himself the reputation of more than ordinary theological scholarship and keenness. It was well known that in the progress of his studies he has more and more withdrawn from the stand-point of the Tübingen school, and returned to, or, at least, approached, more conservative and orthodox views. In the present work he treats even the founder and master of the Tübingen school, T. C. Baur, with very little respect. On the other hand, he is an admirer of Kant and Schleiermacher, after whose death German theology, in his opinion, has steadily declined, so as to be threatened with complete ruin. He develops his own view of theology, which materially differs from all theological schools of Germany, and is regarded by some of his critics as an attempt to recognize the conservative Catholics and the High Church Protestants on the basis of the doctrines which were fully defined and adopted

by the Christian Church of the first five centuries. On all sides, however, the eminent ability of the work is acknowledged. The work will be completed in two volumes.

Wolfgang von Goethe, the grandson of the great poet, has begun the publication of an interesting work on the Greek Cardinal Bessarion, who in the fifteenth century played a prominent part in the endeavors for bringing about a union of the Greek and Roman Churches. (*Studien und Forschungen über das Leben und die Zeit des Cardinals Bessarion.*) The first number contains several essays on the Council of Florence, at which the Greek Bishops, to obtain aid from the western nations against the Turks, consented to a union which was repulsive to the majority of the people, and which, therefore, most of them had to disown as soon as they returned home.

A new edition of the Greek text of the apocryphal works of the Old Testament has been prepared by Prof. O. F. Fritzsche, of Jena, (*Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece.* Leipsig. 1871,) who for years has made these books his special study, and has already published several commentaries on them. He gives them in the following order: 1. The Greek Ezra; 2. Esther, with the additions, in a double text; 3. The Greek additions to the Book of Daniel, in the text of Theodotion, besides that of the Septuagint; 4. The Prayer of Manasseh; 5. The Book of Baruch; 6. The Book of Tobit, in a triple text; 7. The Book of Judith; 8. The four Books of Maccabees, of the fourth of which we have thus far not had any good edition; 9. The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach; 10. The Wisdom of Solomon. The edition has been made with careful comparison of the Latin, Syriac, and other translations. Of the fourth Book of Maccabees this edition publishes for the first the correct Greek text. Several pseudographic books of the Old Testament are given in an appendix, which is also published as a separate work. They are the following: 1. The Psalms of Solomon; 2. The Fourth Book of Ezra; 3. The Fifth Book of Ezra; 4. The Apocalypse of Baruch; 5. The Assumption of Moses.

The *Protestantenverein* ("Protestant Union") has recently published the second volume of its annual Year-book, (*Jahrbuch des deutschen Protestantenvereins.* Elberfeld, 1871.) The object of the Year-book is to acquaint all the members of the Union with the progress of the common cause, to aid them in a thorough understanding of all the important questions of the day, and to interest the educated classes of Germany in the objects of the Union. To this end every volume of the Year-book gives a review of the religious history of the past year, one of several biographies of prominent men, some of the best essays delivered in the course of the past year in the branch societies of the Protestant Union, the proceedings of the General Assembly of the Protestant Union, (*Protestantentag*), and an account of the progress of the Union. The first volume of the Year-book was published in 1869; last year none was published on account of the French-German war. The volume just published contains a review of the year by Hossbach; an account of the labors and the statistics of the Protestant Union during the past year, by Hönig; the fundamental views

of the primitive Christian congregations, by Prof. Lipsius, of the University of Kiel; a biographical article on Arndt, by Prof. Schenkel; a Protestant testimony against modern Lutheranism, by Prof. Baumgarten, of Rostock; Darwinism and Religion, by Dr. Zittel, of Heidelberg; Two Trials for Heresy, by Prof. Nippold, of Heidelberg. The Year-book is edited by Dr. Thomas and Lic. Hoebach, and among its contributors, besides the above names, are mentioned Prof. Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, the President of the Union; Prof. Holtzendorff, of the University of Berlin; Dr. Schwarz, of Gotha, and other well-known representatives of the Liberal party.

A new extensive Life of Jesus, from the stand-point of the critical school, was begun in 1867, by Professor Keim, of Zurich, under the title, "History of Jesus of Nazareth, in its Concatenation with the General History of His People." (*Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*. Zurich, 1867.) A second volume of this work has recently been published, which embraces the period from the sermon on the mount to the sermon on the sending out of the disciples.

Prof. Fr. Nitzsch has published the first volume of a new "History of the Christian Doctrines," (*Grundriss der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. I. *Die Patristische Periode*. Berlin, 1870.) Differing in many respects from his predecessors, the author intends not to trace the history of the several more or less unconnected doctrines, but the organic growth of the system of Christian doctrines. As the center of the Christian doctrine, he regards the historical confession that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, and that as such he has established the salvation of the world. The Patristic period to which this first volume is devoted is divided into two sections. The former extends to the end of the second, the latter to the middle of the eighth century. During the former the foundation of the "Old Catholic" Church doctrine is laid by fixing the formal creed; during the second the Church doctrine is systematically developed; for the process of this development, the doctrine of the divinity of Christ—not, as Baur thinks, that of the Trinity—constitutes the central point of the Old Catholic Church system. Next to it in importance, and closely connected with it, is the doctrine of the Church, as an institution of salvation. The history of these two doctrines is, therefore, treated as the stem of the doctrinal progress of the Church during this period; the other doctrines are regarded and treated as offshoots of this stem.

HOLLAND.

Professor Scholten, of the University of Leyden, is one of the most prolific, as well as the most prominent, representatives of the Rationalistic school of theology of Holland. He has recently published a new elaborate work on the Gospel of Luke and its relation to the Gospels of Mark and Matthew and the Acts, (*Het Paulinisch Evangelie*. Leyden, 1870.) This work supplements those previously published by him on the Gospel of John, (1864,) and on the oldest Gospel, (1868,) in the latter of which he tried to ascertain the primitive form of the evangelical history in the

Gospels of Mark and Matthew. The Gospel of Luke, the last of the three synoptic evangelists, is, according to Scholten, intended to be the apologist of Paulinism against Judaism and Jewish Christianity, and the same tendency he finds in the Acts. He differs, therefore, from other champions of the same school, like Hilgenfeld, who looks upon the Acts as a work which does not contain the genuine Paulinism, and finds an admixture of un-Pauline elements even in the Gospel of Luke. Scholten finds the first vestige of the existence of this Gospel about the middle of the second century.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A *Defense of "Our Fathers," and of the Original Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church against the Rev. Alexander M'Caine and Others.* With Historical and Critical Notes of American Methodism. By JOHN EMORY, D. D. 8vo., pp. 154. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

If you would teach your son to reason, said Locke, let him study Chillingworth. So if the Church would teach her sons both to reason well and to defend her institutes, let them study John Emory. We do not wonder that before his clear, manly, exhaustive logic the followers of Alexander M'Caine dissipated like a belated frost before the clear sun of a May morning. We need little more, perhaps, than John Emory and the History of our Discipline, by Robert Emory, for the refutation of our good and able brethren, who, without the disloyalty of Alexander M'Caine, are making a movement upon our episcopacy with analogous arguments.

The question of main and immediate practical importance now before the Church to us seems to be just this: *Has the General Conference the right to abolish our episcopal ordination and to limit the episcopal office to four years by a mere majority, and without her two thirds majority and the three fourths majority in the Annual Conferences?*

To this we gave in our July Quarterly a negative answer. We say that the Restrictive Rule declares that a General Conference majority alone "shall not do away with episcopacy;" that is, shall not do it away in whole or in any essential part; and in that episcopacy, as received from Mr. Wesley by the framers of that Rule, *Ordination and Life-tenure* were held to be *essential and constituent parts*. To remove them is therefore "to do away episcopacy" in the sense of the framers of the Rule.

Our business, then, is to show what was the Episcopal IDEA

framed by Mr. Wesley, accepted by our fathers, and deposited in the Restrictive Rule.

The broad principle upon which our system is built is, as said in our last Quarterly, the inherent right of every Church to shape its government for the highest good to man and glory to God. This may properly be called, as it is by Dr. Reid, "the optional theory." The fundamental axiom was quoted by us from Wesley in our late article on this subject (July Quarterly, p. 526, foot-note) in the following words: "I still believe the episcopal form of Church government to agree with the writings of the apostles; but that it is prescribed in Scripture I do not believe. This, which I once zealously espoused, *I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's 'Irenicon.'* I think that he has unanswerably proved that NEITHER CHRIST NOR HIS APOSTLES PRESCRIBE ANY PARTICULAR FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT." Our capitals signalize what we call the Wesleyan AXIOM. From this we deduced the resistless inference, (in same foot-note,) "Of course, then, they no more prescribed *two orders* than *three*." And we may now add, of course they no more prescribed three orders than five.

This broad Wesleyan basal principle, or *axiom*, our article (p. 527) re-affirmed in the following explicit words: "Though A CHURCH MAY SHAPE ITSELF INTO SUCH FORM AS IS PROVIDENTIALLY BEST ADAPTED TO EFFECT ITS TRUE PURPOSES, and though other forms of Church government are doubtless permitted, yet we believe episcopacy to be apostolically sanctioned, *though not enjoined*, and primarily the best form of government for the most efficient evangelical action." Such was "the prelacy," (!) forsooth, of our article.*

Confirmatory of all this Dr. Emory, through sixteen pages of his work, quotes from Stillingfleet a variety of pertinent passages; passages by which Wesley's mind was influenced as every candid mind must be influenced. Primarily (according to these extracts) even in England the reason for adopting episcopacy was not any "pretense of divine right, but the conveniency of this form of Church government to the state and condition of the Church at the time of its reformation." Archbishop Whitgift was the first who solemnly vindicated hierarchy; yet even he asserts that "*no kind of government is expressed in the word, or can necessarily be concluded from thence*;" and again, "no form of Church government is by the Scriptures prescribed to or commanded the Church

* See also Whedon's Commentary, vol. iii, pp. 74, 146.

of God." Of course, then, we again infer there are by divine prescription no more two orders than three, or three than two. Chemnitius, indeed, is approvingly quoted as affirming that "the word of God nowhere commands what or how many *degrees* and *orders* of ministers there shall be; and that in the Apostles' times there was not the like number in all the Churches." Such is the basal doctrine of our Church polity.

To all this the able editor of the "Canada Christian Guardian" replies, that Mr. Wesley "vindicated" our episcopacy on the fact that episcopate and eldership are one order.* One order, we reply, by New Testament example and even somewhat in the post-apostolic Church, but *not one by divine prescription for the Church of all time*. The thoughtful editor has chosen precisely the right word, "vindicated." Mr. Wesley "*vindicated*" his ordination by this statement, but *based* it on the broad "optional" axiom. He vindicated himself against the clamors of High Churchmen on the established fact that in the New Testament the *episcopos* and the *presbyteros* were one. It was a shield; an *argumentum ad homines*, accomplishing its defensive purpose. The axiom, that no limitation is divinely laid down to either two or three orders, underlay this vindication. That axiom Mr. Wesley never forgot. He expressly tells us that he was ashamed of maintaining any other doctrine ever since he had read Stillingfleet. It must therefore be assumed, on his own authority, as permanently underlying all his subsequent utterances and movements.

In regard to the proper nature of "orders," we said in our Article, (p. 526,) "How can there be an ordination if not to an order?" This question embraces an entire argument. The old verbs to *ordain* and to *order* were different forms of the same word, used in the ritual of the Anglican Church, of which Wesley was a presbyter. To *order* signifies to endow with *orders*, just as to magnetize signifies to endow with magnetism. And so Webster rightly defines "ordination, in the Episcopal Church, the act of conferring holy *orders* or sacerdotal power; called also consecration." And so the old Thirty-sixth Article of the Anglican Church says, "The Book of Consecration . . . doth contain all things necessary for such consecration or *ordering*. And, therefore, whosoever are consecrated or *ordered* according to the rites of that book . . . we decree all such to be rightly . . . consecrated or

* "Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church convinced me, many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain."—*Tyerman's Life of Wesley*, vol. iii, p. 435.

ordered." The word had this import because to the mind of the Church the thing had this nature. *Ordination* was the mode and test of an *order*. As an Anglican Churchman Mr. Wesley's mind was shaped to the assumption that a valid ordination always conferred valid orders. Although the word *order* is an ecclesiastical rather than a scriptural term, and is of very flexible import, yet the best definition we can give it would be thus: Order is a rank of ministry constituted by election and ordination, permanently and successively continued in a Church. Our episcopate would thus be an order.

Nor does the fact that Mr. Wesley assumed the primitive oneness of the *episcopos* and the *presbyteros* at all preclude the further fact that when an *episcopos* is set apart by ordination, and is made, by the same customary life-tenure as belongs to the eldership, the executive performer of all future constitutionally valid ordinations, there is thereby a new "order" properly inaugurated, and the two primary orders become a triplicate. In one aspect there are two, in the other three. We do not think this is quite rightly expressed by saying, with Watson and others, that there are two orders and an office. For then we should find this anomaly in our system, that there is an immensely larger difference of power between our order and office than between our two orders! And, second, the Wesleyan axiom precludes our holding the two lower grades any more a divinely appointed order than the other. Viewed, however, as primitively and permanently possessing in itself inherently the constitutive and ordaining power, the *eldership* does embrace the episcopate in itself as a unit, and there exist but the two orders, the eldership and the diaconship. In the eldership it inheres to supplement all breaks in the episcopal succession, by *inaugurating the line anew*. Whether the break occur by death, or by an apostasy on the part of the episcopal body, requiring a secession of the pious from its authority, in the eldership it lies to reconstruct the episcopate anew. Viewed, then, as an ordained, life-tenured institute, divinely sanctioned though not absolutely prescribed, the episcopate is a new order, and the entire orders are three. For all the purposes of our present showing the incapacity of a General Conference majority to remove the life-tenured ordination of our Bishops, we shall show that by our constitutional documents *there are three orders*.

The eldership is by scriptural precedent and by the natural course of things, as embodying the mass of the mature ministry, - the main body and trunk of the ministerial strength and power.

As such it is naturally and crudely the undeveloped *one order*. Just as, naturally and by sacred precedent and expediency, it reserves the diaconate order as its preparatory pupilage, so it flowers up into the episcopacy as its concentrated representative *order*. Fundamentally, there may thus be one order; subsidiarily, a second order; and derivatively, yet superior in function, a third order. The ordership and organic permanence is constituted in all three cases, according to sacred precedent, by ordination. The highest of the three orders is especially, as it happens, perpetuated by a series of ordaining hands, passing from predecessor to successor, bishop authenticating bishop, as elder does not authenticate elder, or deacon, deacon. Hence, though, as derivative, it is in origin less an order, and an inferior order, yet, as constituted, it becomes more distinctively an order than either of the other two. The New Testament furnishes, indeed, no decisive precedent of an ordained and permanently fixed super-presbyterial order; but it does furnish classes and instances of men exercising super-presbyterial authority, so that pure and perfect parity of office is not divinely enjoined. Such classes and cases are the apostles, perhaps the evangelists, St. James of Jerusalem, and Timothy and Titus. For the permanent organization of a Church, then, the three orders, though not divinely enjoined, are divinely authenticated.

Wesley held that the episcopate and eldership were so one order that the *power* constituting an episcopal order inhered in the eldership; but he did not believe that there lay in the eldership a *right* to exercise that power without a true providential and divine call. Thus he said, in a letter to Rev. Thomas Adam, 1755: "It is not clear to us that *presbyters so circumstanced as we are* may appoint or *ordain* others; but it is that we may direct, as well as suffer, them to do what we conceive they are moved to by the Holy Ghost." Hence, in his episcopal diploma given to Coke, he announces, "I, John Wesley, *think myself providentially CALLED* at this time to set apart," etc. "And, therefore, *under the protection of Almighty God* I have this day set apart," etc. And Coke, in assenting beforehand to receive "the power of ordaining others," (that is, an exclusive super-presbyterial or episcopal power,) declares in regard to Wesley's right to confer such power, "I have not a shadow of doubt but *God hath invested you with*, for the good of our connection," etc. Emory spends seven pages (38-45) in proving against M'Caine that this was an intentional and a valid episcopal ordination. He bases it largely on Wesley's divine call as "father" and founder to act (as we styled it) as "spiritual arch-

bishop." "Mr. Wesley," says Emory, "did himself assert that he believed himself to be 'a scriptural *episcopos* as much as any man in England or in Europe.' And he asserted this with direct reference to his 'acting as a *bishop*,' in reply to the remarks of his brother Charles. If by *episcopos* he did not mean to aver himself *a bishop in fact*, and entitled to 'act as a bishop,' in our acceptation of the term, then his reply did not meet his brother's objection." (P. 44.) On three grounds, then, Mr. Wesley was "a spiritual archbishop." *First*, he was a presbyter of the Church, a rank in which the primordial power inheres of conferring orders. *Second*, this presbyterial rank would not constitute a right to ordain without a divine providential *call*, and that call actually existing was the second ground. *Third*, a people, also called providentially, with a great future before it, needed, waited for, and was ready to accept this ordination and its threefold orders as the fundamental form of its Church. And thus by this conjoint action and composite act of founder, ministry, and people, we repeat, in the face of all the reclamations which our affirmation has encountered, *there was created as true an episcopacy as has ever existed in the Christian Church.*

These views, we trust, show a perfect consistency between our Church theory and our episcopal ordinations. Within a few months past, indeed, the notion has come into a simultaneous currency among our Methodist periodicals, from Toronto, through Cincinnati down to Pittsburgh, that there is a yawning contradiction through our whole history between our ecclesiastical doctrine and our episcopal ordination. This is said, apparently, to *prepare the way for the abolition of that ordination*. Already, as the "North-western" sadly tells us, there are plenty of very wise ones who flout that ordination as a "farce." The Pittsburgh says, "The practice of the Church," that is, ordination, "supports Dr. Whedon, the theory condemns him." The Western thinks there is a "contradiction," with which "we have got along very well," "provided we have the courage to acknowledge it." If there be such a contradiction, it is certainly a very serious one. Of the two sides of a contradiction one side must be *false*; and here, it seems, the falsehood lies in the ordination. So that we have a streak of falsehood in our system, running from John Wesley to the present hour! Mr. Wesley was the author of it in the ordination of Coke! And all the sapient editor of the Quarterly is doing, is to stop up this yawning crack with a little of his logical putty. Now a falsehood so willfully and clearly persisted in must be a *lie*; and a lie solemnly invoking, as our ordination does, the presence and notice of AL-
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXIII.—43

mighty God must be *perjury*; and perjury flagrantly performed in a sacred rite must be nothing less than *sacrilege*. Surely, if our Church has carried this sacrilegious lie in her right hand from her birth, we disagree with Dr. Merrill that "we have got along very well." To abolish our episcopal ordination on the assumption of such a lie would be an insult to our whole history, a libel and a blot upon the whole scroll of our radiant saintship.

These brethren, perhaps, defend our founders from the charge of *conscious* lying sacrilege by saying that those primitive men, Wesley, Coke, and Asbury, did not see the "contradiction!" So that wisdom will not only die with our talented young brethren, but was born with them, and never was born until they were born. Our ancestors are graciously saved from being made liars by being made simpletons! And it takes the new-born prodigies of our present day to "acknowledge" what fools they were! May we not gently suggest to Dr. Merrill that these courageous imputations are "at variance with all we have gathered from standard writers and the history of the Church?" Where have they assured us that they contradicted themselves? What proof is there that they held the doctrine that they were guilty of a contradiction which they had not intellect enough to perceive? May we not hint, too, to our Pittsburgh brother, that a "law" ought to be passed padlocking the lips that thus emulate the O'Kellys and the McCaines of former days in calumniating "our fathers?" Were these imputations upon our Church and founders made by outside assailants, would not the impulsive loyalty of these brethren lay quick hands upon their controversial weapons to repel the bigoted slander? Do these courageous and perspicacious brethren imagine that "our fathers," possessing, perhaps, as keen intellects as their successors, were not well trained by the demands of the hour to this very discussion? Do they suppose that this pretense of a "contradiction" was not encountered from enemies and false brethren, perfectly understood, and fully provided against? Let us hear John Emory:

In whatever sense distinct ordinations constitute distinct *orders*, in the same sense Mr. Wesley certainly intended that we should have three orders; for he undeniably instituted three distinct ordinations. All the forms and solemnities requisite for the constituting of any one order, in this sense were equally prepared and recommended by him to us for the constituting of three orders. The term "*ordain*" is derived from the Latin *ordino*, to order, create, or commission one to be a public officer—and this from *ordo*, order. And hence persons *ordained* are said to be persons in "holy orders."—*Emory's Defense*, page 63.

This is in reality just what we maintain, that the word "order" has no precise inflexibility, and that in a proper sense, the very

sense needed for our argument, there is a true order just where there is a true ordination. "How can there be an ordination," we asked, (p. 526,) "if not to an order?" So far, then, from a "variance" from our standards we do but repeat them. Humbly and proudly we say it, we are standing just in the tracks of John Emory, and refuting like assaults with like argument.

We are not so sure that we correctly said that Dr. Bangs, whose work we have not read since some thirty years ago, defends our government on the presbyterian theory of two divinely appointed orders, the third being only an office. A fresh glance at his book (subject to correction) reveals that he does call the third an "order," though not a divinely appointed order. But the difficulty for him is, that by the Wesleyan axiom of optionalism the other two are no more divinely appointed than the third. They are *all* thereby orders, or *neither*. Dr. Bangs wrote a book maintaining that the *evangelists* were a New Testament super-presbyterial "order," and a precedent for our episcopate. He also wrote an article for Buck's Dictionary, saying that Methodists had three orders of ministry. For this—so history repeats itself—he was assailed for "prelacy" and "high-churchism," and he published in Emory's Defense his reply, containing the following passage: "I consider it a simple statement of a matter of fact that the Methodist Episcopal Church acknowledges three *orders* of ministers—deacons, elders, and bishops; which fact certainly no one can contradict, still understanding the word *order*, when applied to bishops, as above defined;" that is, as defined in application to *evangelists*. "If any choose to say that we acknowledge two *orders only*, and a superior minister possessing delegated jurisdiction chiefly of an executive character, he has my full consent. I will not dispute about words."* Similarly, Emory, in his *Episcopal Controversy Reviewed*, (p. 47,) says: "The Methodist Episcopal polity recognizes both an *order* of bishops officially superior to presbyters, and the order of deacons."

Thus far we have discussed Wesley's idea of his episcopacy; † we shall next show that that *idea* was by the authors of our Restrictive Rule so framed into that Rule as not to be diminished,

* "It will be perceived that we have all along recognized *three orders* in the ministry—deacons, elders or presbyters, and superintendents or bishops—without, however, supposing that this third order in the ministry is essential to the existence and vitality of the Church."—*Bangs's Original Church of Christ*, p. 304. This we hold to be the true ground; not that we have two orders and an office.

† For proof that Wesley intended to ordain Coke a true bishop, see our book-notice of "Tyerman's Wesley," on a subsequent page.

in part or in whole, without the three fourths concurrent votes of our Annual Conferences. Let now our readers, with us, take our little book of Discipline and open to its very first section, entitled "Origin of the Methodist Episcopal Church." This section, separately, is a very primitive document, framed by the fathers who received the episcopate from Wesley, in 1785, and was handed down through the framers of the Restrictive Rule to our General Conference of 1872. Whatever *idea* it furnishes of our episcopacy as named in the Restrictive Rule is therefore the true idea. For it is the *idea*—sense and meaning—of the framers of a document which remains its true idea forever. This authoritative document tells us, among other things, that Wesley, "*preferring the episcopal mode of government to any other,*" (so that it was a purely "optional" form, no orders, more or less, being divinely prescribed,) "*set apart Thomas Coke for the episcopal OFFICE;*" (so that here the episcopate is an *office*;) "*and having given to him letters of EPISCOPAL ORDERS,*" (so that this *office* is, also, *ORDERS*, the words being used interchangeably,) Mr. Wesley "*commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury to the same episcopal office;*" so that both Mr. Wesley and our Discipline assume that exclusive executive right to ordain was normally to be reserved to these episcopally ordained bishops and their episcopally ordained successors; the successional principle being thus recognized both by Wesley and by us. Finally, "the General Conference did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their bishops, being fully satisfied of the VALIDITY OF THEIR ORDINATION." Here is the clincher. In the episcopacy—that is, "*episcopal orders*" received by our General Conference from Mr. Wesley—"validity of ordination" was one of the things in which they required to be "satisfied." "Ordination," therefore, and "valid ordination," was one of the essentials in this episcopal order. Now it was these same men who enshrined the same episcopate (of which valid ordination was an essential) in our General Rules, and required that no mere majority of the General Conference should "do away episcopacy." But, surely, to *do away* an essential constituent of a thing is to *do away* the thing. If you can *do away* one essential you can another; and there is just the same right to *do away* all, one by one or altogether, as to *do away* one alone.

And in their expressive Saxon our fathers do not say *abolish*, as by a single complete act, but *do away*, as by a series of partial acts, wearing off by degrees, or breaking off by piecemeal.

If a mere majority can take away the ordination of the bishops, and not thereby *do away episcopacy*, it can in the same way take away the life-tenure. It can then take away the power to ordain. It can then take away the election by simply doing nothing. And thus a majority may take away every part and not "do away episcopacy." There is no other mode of preserving our Church constitution herein than to ascertain what were the constituents of the idea of episcopacy as held by the framers of the Restrictive Rule, and rigidly insist that nothing but the constitutional process shall abate one jot or tittle. And when our brother of Pittsburgh tells us that the practice of the Church sustains our views, we submit whether that does not settle the whole question. For this "practice" is embodied in and is the expression of our fundamental law; law, in collision with which no "theory," no "standard writers," can for a moment stand, even as the weaker side of a "contradiction."

We said that "the office conferred on Coke had all the attributes we can ascribe to an order; namely, 1. *Ordination*; 2. *Exclusive right to ordain*; 3. *Life-tenure*; and, 4. *Successional permanence in the future*." This we re-assert, and proceed, in addition to what has been said, to show. And first, as to *ordination*, we remark: 1. Before Coke's *ordination*, Asbury, under title of general assistant, "had," as Coke and Asbury say, "exercised all the authority of a bishop excepting that of ordination."—*Hist. Discipline*, p. 336. *For the want of ordination he was held as no bishop*; and, however inconveniently, no sacraments were to be allowed; which, by the way, demonstrates the second of the four attributes, namely, *Exclusive right to ordain*. It was by his ordination, then, that Asbury became a bishop and the sacraments became possible. By the idea of Wesley and our fathers, then, the *ordination* is an essential constituent of their episcopate. By the withholding ordination our bishop is reduced from a bishop to a "general assistant" of the Asbury type previous to Wesley's ordaining act. By withholding ordination you "do away with episcopacy" as it is, at a single blow. So that we repeat that the bishop elect has the same right to ordination as the elder elect, and the General Conference has no right to withhold it. 2. By that ordaining act, and dependently upon it, our fathers assumed the title of Methodist Episcopal Church. Withdraw the ordination, and, according to their idea, we are no longer episcopal. Our very *name* is a demonstration of our argument. If we drop the ordination we have no historical right to retain the title. 3. We have already

shown, by the very first section of our Discipline, that they held the episcopal office to be *orders*, and considered valid orders a condition to our valid episcopal Churchdom. 4. Mr. Wesley sent them a liturgy containing, in his own words, "The Form and Manner of *making** and Ordaining of Superintendents, Elders, and Deacons." This "form" is the English form of ordaining a bishop, slightly modified, showing that under the name superintendent Mr. Wesley really, in his own idea, ordained Coke a bishop. 5. All our "standard writers" have, with one voice, maintained that Coke was a true bishop; that Wesley intentionally and validly ordained him, and that our episcopate is that very same Wesleyan episcopate, made by a valid ordination, and, as an episcopate valid by a valid ordination, imbedded entire in our Restrictive Rule, not to be minified of its essentials save by the constitutional two thirds and three fourths majorities.

And this was, by the Wesleyan idea, a *life-tenured* ordination and order. Where is the proof that Mr. Wesley held to a *periodic* Episcopate? The burden rests with those who assert it. Wesley proposed to frame an ordained episcopate according to the pattern of the *primitive Church*. But where in all ecclesiastical history is there any instance of a periodical ordained episcopate? If Wesley's episcopate is periodical, so is his eldership. His optional axiom sweeps both alike. If his "form" of threefold ordinations shows no purpose of a life-tenured episcopate, then it shows no life-tenured presbyterate. In all our episcopal elections, from the first quadrennial General Conference to the last, probably never a voter doubted that he was voting an ordaining, life-tenured episcopate, such being his actual *intention*. So that a life-tenured episcopate has been *unanimously voted* by every General Conference, and unanimously accepted by every Annual Conference. The life-tenure has thus all the permanence of unquestioned law. This unanimity for a life-tenured episcopate has been as perfect as the unanimity for a life-tenured eldership. And if a General Conference majority may abolish one, it can abolish the other. Both life-tenures are on the same platform, and both stand or fall together. As to *successional permanence*, no one, we presume, will dispute that Mr. Wesley empowered Coke to ordain Asbury, as mentioned in our quotation from the first section of our Discipline, in order, according to the practice of all episcopal Churches, to establish the *successional* method by ordination. This inference is

* By the Wesleyan idea, (modified, we believe, before the adoption of the Restrictive Rule,) the bishop was "made," not by the election, but solely by the ordination.

necessary from the very fact that he held himself as giving, as our Methodism held herself as receiving, a permanent Church constitution. For this he gave the "form" for all the three successional orders alike. And here, again, the episcopate and presbyterate are in the same boat. "Mr. Wesley," say Coke and Asbury, "consecrated one for the office of a bishop that our episcopacy might *descend* from himself." *

And it would be well for our brethren who hold that we have two divinely established orders, to remember that the Wesleyan axiom of optionalism underlies them, and reflect *whether the episcopate is not the true safeguard of the presbyterate?* The episcopate has the intrenchment of the Restrictive Rule, but the *presbyterate has not even that*. All a General Conference has to do is to abolish its ordination from the Discipline. Leading minds among us bottom the whole ministry simply on the divine call, and hint about ordination being "a fetish" or "a farce." Leading minds among us hold, also, that there is, in fact, no more *special divine call* for the ministry than for any other calling. We are told truly that a man is a minister before he is a presbyter, and it is equally true that a man is a Christian before he is baptized. But we reply, If there is a call to the ministry, there is also a divinely required recognition of that call by the divinely appointed Church of Christ. Divinely, if there be a ministry there also is a Church. "In ordinary cases," says Wesley, "both an inward and an outward call are requisite." Baptism is the divinely required recognition of regeneration; ordination is the divinely authorized form, *in the absence of all others* justly binding on the conscience, of the Church's recognition of a divinely called ministry. To hold firmly by the organism as the machinery for great religious results is Methodism; to sacrifice the machinery to pure spiritualism is Quakerism.

Of this last of the above two classes of thinkers, some do manfully oppose the proposed innovation on the true ground, that the very object of a churchdom is to regulate these pure subjectivisms. They well understand that if our episcopacy be "done away," a *jure divino* presbyterate will furnish no solid bottom. There is no solid bottom; all is a sea of unregulated subjectivity. Well, then, may our eldership query whether our intrenched episcopacy is not the best safe-guard for the presbyterate.

If our argument has been sound and true, then for a General Conference majority to "do away" with either of the four elements

* "As to the episcopacy, which we may not do away, the power to ordain is essential to its being."—*Hamline's Speech*.

of the episcopate named is a *violation of the constitution of the Church*. It is a violence done to our Wesleyan episcopacy, striking at our venerable founders of blessed memory, striking the person of the greatest religious reformer of modern time, John Wesley himself. It will be a usurpation over the rights of our Annual Conferences, by whose suffrage such a vote should be decided. It will be a usurpation over the rights of our three orders of ministry, each of whom, episcopate, eldership, and deaconship have a right to hold up their gown in defiance of the General Conference. Even if the constitutionality were only doubtful, a wise and discreet body will, where no exigency demands bold measures, rigidly construe its own powers. Very wisely was this done in the lay delegation question. Those of its friends who believed it in the power of the General Conference consented, nevertheless, to submit it to not only the Conferences but to the people. Wisely will it ever thus be done. The two third and three fourth votes are simply securers of wise deliberation in the Church; of sober second and third thought, before a great change is made. Where a large, steady, earnest majority of long years presses a change, the minority, it may be safely calculated, will ever yield. So that, even though a great change is not named in the Restrictive Rule, it will ever be wise for a General Conference, before any great movement, to resort to that method at least of consulting the mind of the Church.

It will be sad, nay, perhaps perilous, for our ministry to go before our first body of General Conference laymen with a radical organic quarrel, as if to give them a first lesson of disintegration. Cheerfully we trust that, as in the Church South, our lay body will be found a rock against which the surges of innovation will beat in vain.* The very first utterance of the very first delegation elect confirms this trust. We take pleasure in here placing on permanent record those utterances, which, eloquent as they are loyal, are a right worthy key-note to the whole future of lay legislation.

We are not unaware of the fact that many who have clearly discerned, and have been warmly devoted to, the distinctive features of our economy, to which we have been chiefly indebted, under God, for our wonderful prosperity, have been distrustful of the great change in our polity involved in the introduction of lay delegation into the General Conference. We deem it proper, therefore, to declare, at the threshold of this new era, our profound devotion to the distinctive features of our economy. We but utter the view of those who elected us, and all our Churches in

* This prediction was written before the loyal and conservative utterances of the laymen of Genesee, Erie, and Michigan had verified it, and almost made the preceding arguments unnecessary.

this Conference, when we declare that there is perfect satisfaction with our doctrines and discipline, that our brethren love devotedly and entirely the glorious Gospel which you and your fathers have so faithfully preached. We believe it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. We glory in the cross of Christ; in the free grace offered to every man; in the full salvation from all sin, so distinctive and blessed a truth of our holy religion; in the whole word of God, able to make all who accept it wise unto salvation.

We equally approve the usages of our Church. We esteem our Sunday-schools, class-meetings, love-feasts, camp-meetings, all the many forms of Church life which give our Church, above all others, that variety of worship which makes every form, without weariness, full of freshness and power.

We highly prize the order of our Church. The itinerancy we esteem by far the best mode of supplying the pulpit which exists in the Church universal. It gives the variety of talent which we crave and need for attracting all classes in the community, and giving every one a portion of meat in due season. It gives all our ministerial brethren a place to labor, so that none are compelled to stand in the market-place lamenting that "no man hath hired us." It makes us enjoy many pastors, and feel that all our brethren are as our pastors. It makes the ministry and membership of one heart and mind as no other system possibly can. The presence of the laity in the General Conference, so far from weakening, will establish the itinerancy. We none the less approve of the itinerant general superintendency. We are heart and soul *Methodist Episcopalians*. We rejoice in our system of government. We believe it is essential to our unity and success. The bishops are our bishops no less than yours. They give us pastors as they give you Churches. We waive our rights to select our ministers as you do to select your parish. With you, we leave this decision to bishops of our joint approval, and hereafter of our joint election. We do not believe our Church can thrive on any other system. The clashing of pulpit and pew would be instant and incurable if this common bond were ruptured.

We rejoice that God has raised up such wise and holy men for the work in our past history, one of whom, coming from within the bounds of our own Conference, among the best beloved and most honored of them all, has recently left his work below for the reward of heaven.

We shall rejoice to unite with you in *conserving this superintendency in the wise form which has been so efficient in the past, and by which it has been preserved from all the influences which would impair the impartial exercise of its high functions.*

Commentary on the New Testament. Intended for Popular Use. By D. D. WHEDON, LL.D. Vol. III. Acts—Romans. 12mo., pp. 402. New York: Carlton & Lanahan; San Francisco: E. Thomas; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.

The completion of our third volume justifies the expression of the hope that it may be received with the same favor as has been extended to the two previous. It has, in the course of development, become entirely clear that to complete the work in less than two more volumes would destroy its proper proportions as a whole. If completed, as it doubtless will be by the present or another hand, it will then present a manual New Testament of such medium dimensions for popular use as has not as yet, to our knowledge, been laid before the Church or public.

Friendly criticism has suggested that the present volume is too brief, and too completely excludes the accumulated opinions of other commentators; and that a hundred pages or more furnishing counter-views would add to the value of the book. But such

an addition would completely destroy it for its purposes, by placing it practically out of the popular reach. The reason now assigned by large numbers of people for its not being used instead of some other (Calvinistic) commentary, is its cost of a few cents more a volume.* It seems to be of no use in such cases to reply that it is a larger and more finely executed volume; that its earnest conciseness enables it really to furnish much more exegetical matter; and that it is the expounder of a better style of Christian doctrine. The ten-cent argument is frequently all-powerful, and compels the conclusion that the only way of the book's reaching its intended audience is to give, in the most compact form possible, the conclusions of a single mind. And then the advantage results for the ordinary reader that the work is not encumbered with a mass of contradictory matter, the memory does not lose in the last half what was said in the first half, and the unconfused mind grasps a clear, rapid, single, and entire view of the course of sacred thought.

Its intended popular aim has been rather an incentive to, than an excuse from, a thorough reverent yet independent research at any step. It is a serious responsibility to furnish doctrine for a large popular audience. Besides, could we give, as many commentators do, a pile of others' opinions, we might shirk the labor or the responsibility of expressing an opinion of our own. This shirk of responsibility we are, however, frank to confess, belongs not among our personal tendencies. Our opinions usually take positive form and incisive expression; and we do but obey the idiosyncrasy bestowed upon us in giving in our commentary but a serial line of positive results. And yet references to other commentators are often made, and condensed reasons are given to bring the thoughtful reader to see the rectitude of our own conclusions. Great attention has been paid to the current and connection of the sacred writer's thought, as it is by the drift of the whole that the meaning of a particular passage is often settled without the necessity of an argument. Illustrations of this, especially, are Rom. vii, 5-25 and ix. And yet the force of the drift argument will not be duly felt without a careful study of the plan of the book placed at its beginning. When the place occupied by this first above-named passage in the entire current

* And it must be noted as a curious and painful inconsistency, that while our Book Rooms have been held to a minute Methodist orthodoxy in their publications, our editors, ministers, Bible-class teachers, and Sunday-school superintendents have for long years been, from a sort of necessity hitherto, indorsing or circulating the most insinuating Calvinism in the shape of popular commentary.

of the book is appreciated, little argument is needed to show its meaning.

To the "Plan" prefixed to each Book in this volume we would call the special attention of the biblical student. We have had assurance of more than one such student of having had sufficient interest in our commentary to read it through by rapid course. Let that be done with Acts with careful reference to the "Plan," and to the map, and a *wholeness* of view will be attained such as no other way will furnish. Let a similar method be pursued with Romans, and little trouble, we apprehend, need then be felt by the ordinary reader as to the meaning of the book, or of any particular passage. Let this whole volume be thus read, and the scripture student or Christian minister will find deposited in his mind a view of apostolic history and apostolical doctrine scarce attainable in any other way, constituting a fountain of unfailing holy thought.

We call attention, also, to our view of the "Pentecostal Church" in the first third of Acts. It is such as will be found, we think, in no other commentary. Yet we trust that upon examination it will justify itself as grounded on the sacred text, yet fresh and apparent to a true style of "modern thought." St. Luke narrates its history with the vivid interest of a true member of that Church, as we show reason to believe he was. How the preparation was made for the Pentecost—how that startling manifestation of divine presence electrified Jerusalem—how a Church sprung with the suddenness of miracle from its divine impulse—how that Church culminated, with a spirit unknown to the world before, in holiness, in endurance of persecution, self-organizing energy, and power of triumphant conversion, to meet, alas! at its very summit a total downfall and dispersion, to be succeeded by a second and far inferior Jerusalem Church, are described with that unconscious skill of selection and grouping that acquired for Luke from the ancient Church the reputation of being by profession a *painter*. To our own mind it is amazing how commentators endeavor elaborately to obscure the proofs of the complete abolition of that first holy Jerusalem Church, and thus to destroy the singleness and oneness of the picture, and impair its beauty. Wonderful, too, is the fact how the destruction of the City-Church was the creation of the World-Church. After each Jerusalem Christian had been providentially trained to a completeness and hardihood of Christian character, he became a zealous propagandist of Christianity wherever he was driven, and

thus the Church's death was precursor to its glorious resurrection. The second Jerusalem Church was a priest-ridden body; that is, it was kept in cowardice, feebleness, and poverty by the overawing power and presence of the Jewish temple, ritual, and priesthood. We have seen many a poor Methodist Church in a similar cowed position in the presence of some powerful Calvinistic, Ritualistic, or Rationalistic neighbor. This Jerusalem Church was largely, to the last, the troubler of St. Paul. It was semi-Jewish, lazy, and impoverished; nor could all Paul's Christian conquests abroad, and generous gatherings of money for its "poor saints," (mighty poor saints the most of them were!) expand their narrowed souls! It sunk into Socinianism; and has to this day furnished the Rationalist a shadowy ground for saying that the primitive Church held the simple humanity of Christ. Hence the importance of showing the historic difference between the first Pentecostal Church and the second Jerusalem Church.

The Mission of the Spirit; or, the Office and Work of the Comforter in Human Redemption. By Rev. L. R. DUNN. 12mo., pp. 303. New York: Carlton & Lauchan; San Francisco: E. Thomas; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.

Under the old dispensation it was given to the high priest alone to enter the Holy of Holies, where was the glorious Presence; and to the high priest but once a year. But our High Priest has sent the blessed Presence down into his Church, and permitted every one that will to dwell imbued with its blessed influences. Here is the illumination, the consolation, the sanctification, the testimony. Here is the testimony not only to our individual acceptance but to the blessed reality of that faith in which, without undervaluing external evidences, or deeming the outside battle of reason with the infidel unnecessary, the well-centered Christian heart securely rejoices. The ramparts on which the Jewish legions stood to defend the temple lined the outer rim of the court; but the temple and the nation could never have been stormed had Israel been true to the Shekinah within. And inasmuch as, as Mr. Dunn truly says, "the coming and crowning contest of the Church will be about the truths dwelt upon in this volume;" so, if the Church be loyal and strong here, in her place of divine strength there can be no defeat.

In illustration of these truths Mr. Dunn's book is a gem. By its external beauty, thanks to the publishers, it wins the eye; by its pure, glowing, chastened eloquence it wins the taste; by its fresh, warm, spiritual power it quickens the heart. Buy it, read

it, glow with the spirit with which it glows, and pray with the rich fullness of the prayer it arouses, and it will be found that like the prophet's purple cluster, "There is a blessing in it."

It was a happy thought of Mr. Dunn's to introduce (with elegant English translations) several of the best Latin hymns of the Middle Ages. To many a Christian scholar among us the originals will be a treat. We are not among those who are fond of cutting loose from all connection with the historical Church. Even though overshadowed by the Papacy there was a mediæval Church which we cannot consent to surrender to Romanism. These rich evangelical hymns enable us to feel that Methodism is true catholicism. The camp-meeting is in full communion with the cloister. Not one of these hymns, even "of the age of Charlemagne," but, if the Latin were vernacular, they could sing and "get happy" over at Martha's Vineyard. The author of these translations, Dr. Coles, of Newark, has written what Dr. Schaff pronounces the best translation in English of the *Dies Iræ*, at which so many poets have tried their hand, both in England and America.

Mediation. The Function of Thought. 16mo., pp. 213. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1871.

The object of our author is to unfold the qualities in man which elevate him to a fitness to receive a mediator between God and himself. For this purpose he analyzes the spiritual structure of man; and as this can be done neither by anatomizing the brain nor atomizing the spiritual substance, he accomplishes his work by investigation of the action of thought. Here he finds a system entirely above the plane of animalism, towering up, with varied compartments, skyward. In this aspect his work is antidotal to the present bestializing tendencies of Darwinism. In the human mind there are what the author calls types, standards, ideals, in reference to which it reasons. The typical functions of thought which he enumerates are analyzed in a scholarly and critical manner. Whether his enumeration is exact and exhaustive we are not prepared to conclude. If we mistake not, he fails somewhat in clear, consecutive thought. His book is destitute of the artistic divisions which aid in the comprehension of his system. His table of contents, thereby, instead of being a symmetrical analysis is a series of unintelligibilities. This is but a tentative fragment of his work. With all its defects we should open with interest the pages of its sequel.

The Christian Pastorate in its Character, Responsibilities, and Duties. By DANIEL P. KIDDER, D.D. Pp. 569. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1871.

Dr. Kidder is like a painter who draws fresh from nature. His book is not made out of other books, but from the fresh realities before his eyes. His work stands independent of all predecessors, and adapts itself to the history, doctrines, special institutes, and peculiar activities of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He does not, as some would, overlook a matter just because it is directly under his nose, and because it is not in the printed books. Presiding elders, itinerancy, camp-meetings, and even praying bands are things not unknown to him. His chapters on the Duties of the Methodist Pastor in relation to Books, Periodicals, and Tracts—on the Pastor and his Lay Helpers—on the Pastor in Relation to Education, the Press, and the Country, are very suggestive and valuable. The book is full of points for the young minister to know, study, and practice. It will, we trust, contribute largely to the efficiency of our ministry.

The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. By HENRY CONSTABLE, A.M., Prebendary of Cork. Reprinted from the second London edition. 8vo. pp. 67. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield. 1871.

The American editor of this pamphlet states that he was educated in the orthodox doctrine of the eternal torment of the wicked, and retained it until his travels in Europe awakened his reflection to the awful thought that the millions of Europe, Asia, and Africa were, according to that doctrine, bound to endless misery. He finds his relief in the doctrine of annihilationism. We suppose there ever is a class of minds to whom skepticism, universalism, or annihilationism is the result of such reflections. The last of the three he deems least incompatible with an earnest piety. Mr. Chatfield does not issue this as one of the "University Series," although it clearly maintains the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest."

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English, according to the Authorized Version. Corrected by the best Critical Editions of the Original. By FREDERICK GARDINER, D.D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School, Author of "Harmony of the Gospels in Greek," etc. 8vo. pp. 287. Andover: Warren F. Draper; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871.

This is a reproduction in English form of Dr. Gardiner's Greek Harmony. Save in cases of established various readings and universally accepted re-translations, it preserves the words of our common translation. Dr. Coit's paragraphing is adopted. It is

prefaced with a synopsis of the Harmony, an index to every passage, a tabular synopsis of the respective Harmonies of Greswell, Stroud, Robinson, Thomson, and Tischendorf. It is the work of an eminent scholar, and is externally done up with all the tasteful accuracy of the Andover press.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Art, its Laws and the Reasons for them, Collected, Considered, and Arranged for General and Educational Purposes. By SAMUEL P. LONG, Counselor at Law, Student of the English Royal Academy, etc. 12mo., pp. 248. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

This volume consists of fifteen essays in which the principles of beauty are analyzed, and the application of them traced in the various forms of æsthetic art. The first seven discuss personal beauty, the different classes of painting, invention in painting, composition, design, light and shade, and color. Then come critical portraits of the great masters in four more essays, namely, Da Vinci, Michael Angelo and Raphael, Titian, and Correggio. In English and French art, Mr. Long characterizes the natural school under the masters Hogarth, Wilkie, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Sir Benjamin West, and the affected school under David during the tragic scenes of the French Revolution. Next come the various forms of art, as sculpture, and the architectures, Grecian, Roman, and Gothic. The essays are illustrated by six fine engravings.

The volume forms an elegant little manual of the principles of art and art criticism for non-professional readers. The author writes in a fluent, graceful style, in rather long but never obscure sentences. He displays a professional mastery of the whole field; and in the moral and sacred aspects of his subject his heart is in the right place. For the popular speaker, and especially the preacher who has the feeling for illustrating his themes, this volume will be very valuable both for furnishing a field of allusion and securing that his allusions be correct.

Mr. Long has that sense of beauty as a divine thing and a divine aim that he repels the Darwinian theory of development with a sacred disgust. He upholds the Circassian race as the nearest approximation to the perfect standard of beauty for the whole race. Indeed, according to the absolute laws of beauty, the delicate blend of light and shade must be more beautiful than a uniform dusk. It is a curious remark, that as black is no color, it is the Caucasian and not the negro that is "the colored gentleman."

Science and the Bible; or, the Mosaic Creation and Modern Discoveries. By REV. HERBERT W. MORRIS, A.M., formerly Professor of Mathematics in Newington Collegiate Institution. 8vo., pp. 566. Philadelphia: Ziegler & M'Curdy.

This elegant volume traces the Mosaic history of Creation as interpreted by modern science, and unfolds its disclosures in a series of popular dissertations. It is based upon the theory that the creative week consists of seven literal days, not of creation, but of renovation, after a great cataclysm. The existence of such a cataclysm just before the appearance of man upon earth is professionally proved by geological facts and authorities.

The particular theory adopted, however, has an unimportant bearing upon the great body of the work. On either view, the wonders of science, as displayed in the history of creation, remain the same. Over this vast field Professor Morris ranges and gathers magnificent fruit. In a style of full and flowing eloquence the amazing grandeur of the works of God are unfolded, and the mind of the reader is quickened and warmed with emotions of adoration. The minister and the layman will find it a rich treasury of thought clothed in very attractive style.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Founder of the Methodists. By Rev. L. TYERMAN, Author of "The Life and Times of Rev. S. Wesley, M.A., Father of the Revs. J. and C. Wesley." Vol. III. 8vo., pp. 675. London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1871.

Mr. Tyerman's special claim to our attention seems based upon the new matter he has collected, and the honesty with which he states truth, regardless of the influences, favorable or unfavorable, to his subject, which legitimately result. He possesses little grace of style, little historical tact, no power of portraiture or pictorial imagination, makes no pretense of philosophy, and displays no remarkable power of pronouncing a satisfactory judgment upon his facts and characters. Yet by the power of accumulation, by the incorporation of characteristic extracts, and often of entire documents, by abundant details animated by his own real interest in his subject, he has massed together, in lucid order, a body of materials to which the future historian will ever resort, and upon which a class of enthusiastic readers will dwell with interest. He has done upon the whole a great and good work, for which abundant thanks are due him. But the standard life of Wesley is still a *desideratum*.

It will be greatly regretted by American Methodists that Mr.

Tyerman's greatest historical error, manifesting both a disregard of the most abundant facts, and the exercise of a most preposterous judgment, should occur in his treatment of Wesley's organizing our American Episcopate. We should imagine that he had written with a servile regard for the English hierarchy pressing upon his spirit. His utterances would have been food for the soul of Alexander M'Caine, and of our American small but proud High Churchianity. That would be of no consequence, however, were it not a most palpable falsification of historical facts.

Mr. Tyerman denies that Wesley really intended his authentication of Coke to be an ordination of him as American bishop. For that denial he furnishes *not one testimony, nor one historical fact*. It is nothing but his *guess-so*, given in positive form; a guess-so based solely upon his opinion of Coke's ambition to be a bishop, manifested by his well-known propositions to Bishop White for reunion, and to the British government for a bishopric in India. These notorious items he discloses with a wonderful air of revelation. "These," says he, "are unpleasant facts, which we would rather have consigned to oblivion, had they not been necessary to vindicate Wesley from the huge inconsistency of ordaining a co-equal presbyter to be a bishop." Wesley meant the ceremony to be a mere formality likely to recommend his delegate to the favor of the Methodists of America. Coke, in his ambition, wished and intended it to be considered as an ordination to a bishopric." This is a very grave statement very inconsiderately expressed. Contrary to Mr. Tyerman's special profession of disregarding logical consequences in his statement of history, he here professedly writes under control of a motive instead of an evidence. Nor could Coke have been mistaken as to whether it was an ordination or not. There is no alternative. Either it was an ordination or Coke was guilty of a falsehood of a most atrocious character. He most unequivocally lied, and sacrilegiously lied, and deliberately carried the lie across the ocean. And when he came to America with that lie in his mouth he put into the mouth of our American Conference the statement that Wesley had sent him with "letters of episcopal orders," which was, if Mr. Tyerman be correct, a most stupendous lie. And, then, when Coke, falsely pretending to be bishop, proceeded to ordain Asbury to the same grade, all united to embody the lie in external action—a sacrilegious cheat! This was the very ground, maintained by the very same arguments, assumed by M'Caine to show that our episcopacy originated in fraud and should

be abandoned by all honest men. The reply of our noble Bishop Emory blew the base fabrication, as it explodes Mr. Tyerman's ignorant blunders, to the empyrean. After all this we smile at Mr. Tyerman's gracious assurance, "We have no fault to find with the American Methodists being called the Methodist Episcopal Church"—an historical imposture though it be.

We are unable to refute Mr. Tyerman's proof, for he furnishes none to refute. He trots out, indeed, the facts long ago disposed of, that Wesley preferred for Coke the Latin name superintendent to its Greek synonym bishop; though it was plainly because the latter awakened in English minds unfavorable associations with their own hierarchy. He gives in due form Wesley's well-known letter to Asbury, plainly aimed at the dissyllable *bishop*, and not at the grade or power the word expressed. The first proof that Mr. Wesley did not intend to *ordain* Coke to the rank of superintendent, including all the powers, prerogatives, and essentials of our episcopate, Mr. Tyerman does not pretend to furnish. On the contrary, he furnishes one new, contemporary, positive testimony sufficient to refute his own presumptuous guess so a hundred times over. John Pawson was, perhaps, as close in Mr. Wesley's counsels as any man; and we are obliged to Mr. Tyerman for the only valuable contribution he has furnished to this subject in the following words left in a manuscript by Pawson. "He" (Wesley) "foresaw that the Methodists would soon become a distinct body. He was deeply prejudiced against presbyterian, and as much in favor of episcopal, government. In order, therefore, to preserve all that is valuable in the Church of England among the Methodists *he ordained Mr. Mather and Dr. Coke bishops*. These he undoubtedly designed should ordain others. Mr. Mather told us so at the Manchester Conference, in 1791. I believe Mr. Wesley's thought of ordaining arose out of the Bishop of London refusing to ordain a preacher for America." On this we remark: 1. When Mr. Tyerman has disposed of Coke as unreliable, his work is not half done, for he has still the unimpeachable Mather to deal with. Mr. Wesley, entertaining the expectation that the Methodist preachers, in spite of all his efforts, would leave the Church, and would administer the sacraments after his death, ordained Mather a bishop for England in order that it might be authoritatively done. For, 2. When Mr. Wesley said, "I am as scriptural an *episcopos* as there is in all England," he meant, as Dr. Emory rightly argues, more than that he was as good an elder as anybody; which would have been nothing to his purpose. He meant

that by a divine call he had (not only the elders' ecclesiastical *power* to ordain elders, but that he had) the providential *right* to ordain even bishops. The ecclesiastical inherent *power* of an elder to ordain does not make it *right* for every elder to exercise the power at his caprice. The elders of the Methodist Episcopal Church claim the ordaining power, but none would deny a free exercise of the power to be disorderly, and even wicked. By an extract we shall soon give, Mr. Wesley claimed that for his unordained ministers to administer the sacraments would be the sin of Korah; and yet he believed that a bishop ordained by him could have empowered them, by ordination and due churchly organization, to administer the sacraments with perfect rectitude. He believed himself, as we said in the last Quarterly, to be "the spiritual archbishop" of his people, having spiritual powers and *rights which no other elder in England had*. And we concur with him. And that, in our view, answers Mr. Tyerman's statements: "There is force in Dr. Whitehead's critique that Dr. Coke had the same right to ordain Mr. Wesley that Mr. Wesley had to ordain Dr. Coke." We think, as Emory has shown, that there is no "force" in the remark whatever. 3. That Wesley "ordained" Coke (that is, ordained him with episcopal orders) is certain from the fact that he sent a liturgy to America with the due forms for "ordaining" the three orders of superintendent, elder, and deacon. The forms were all, with slight modifications, the ordination forms of the Anglican Church, as we have essentially retained them to this day. This demonstrates with what form Wesley ordained Coke; for certainly he would not have given Coke a more authoritative form for others than he used himself. One sentence, therefore, refutes Mr. Tyerman forever: *Wesley empowered Coke to "ordain" successors, therefore he himself "ordained" Coke*. In the ordination of Coke, Wesley intended to initiate an ordained super-presbyterial successional line for all futurity. 4. Let the reader measure the real power received by Coke from Wesley, and see whether it was less than an episcopate. There was, first, an *ordination conferred*; second, a power bestowed, with a printed form prescribed, to ordain a successor, Asbury being the well-known man intended. Next, his successors were to possess, normally, the exclusive executive right of ordaining men to administer those sacraments for which the people had so long waited in vain. And last, this was to be a permanent successional constitution, established for the long future, because Wesley and our Methodism preferred the episcopal form of government.

This ordination, together with the American election, gave Coke and Asbury jurisdiction over the Methodism of all America. Now, here were, (1.) Ordination; (2.) Exclusive right to ordain; (3.) Power to set agoing a line of ordained successors of same grade; (4.) Intentional organic permanence as a Church with three ordained grades; (5.) Ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the entire continent. If this was not an episcopate, what on earth could be an episcopate? (5.) This Church was to be called the Methodist Episcopal Church. For, even if true that Coke and Asbury were not called bishops until five years after Coke's ordination, yet the Church was called episcopal *immediately*, and with Mr. Wesley's concurrence. But how can there be an episcopal Church without a bishop? How is the bishop any less a bishop because he is to be called by a Latin rather than a Greek title? It might, as Emory justly argues, be just as truly inferred that the second grade were not to be presbyters because they are called elders.*

We could pursue this argument much further, but it was well done a half century ago in Emory's "Defense," and recently in Stevens's History. If Mr. Tyerman has never surveyed the facts which they unfold, he was unprepared to discuss the subject or to express an opinion. He has, in complete disregard to a whole set of facts, given sanction to a whole set of falsehoods, with which our loquacious assailants, both from faction within and sectarianism without, have endeavored to malign and dismember the Methodist Episcopal Church. So thoroughly had these preposterous fictions been slain here in America by our able defenders above mentioned, that their very ghosts but seldom reappeared. Deeply to be regretted it is that their dead carcase should now be "resurrected" in England, clothed with standard authority, and sent, alive and rampant, across the ocean to do a permanent mischief here. Mr. Tyerman would do himself a great justice to revise his facts and reverse his judgments.

The extracts from Wesley's sermon above mentioned, preached in Cork, and published by Wesley in the "Arminian Magazine" a few months before his death, show that Wesley's last thoughts held ordination to be a very essential requisite for the administration of sacraments.

God has commissioned you to call sinners to repentance; but it does by no means follow from hence that ye are commissioned to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamt of this till ten or twenty years after ye began to preach. Ye did not then, like *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, seek the priesthood also.*

* See on these points our book-notice of Emory's "Defense of our Fathers."

Ye knew, "No man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." O contain yourself within your own bounds! Be content with preaching the Gospel. Do the work of evangelists. I earnestly advise you, abide in your place; keep your own station. . . . Ye yourselves were at first called in the Church of England; and though ye have and will have a thousand temptations to leave it, regard them not. Be *Church of England* men still. Do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God raised you up.

History of Frederick the Second, called Frederick the Great. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 584. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.

The light of civilization reveled in the sunny South for ages while chill and darkness reigned among the barbarians who skirted the Baltic. By the brightening twilight, their hard, fierce figures and features are slowly revealed to view. As the warming and enlightening day advances they slowly soften, and their rude vigor becomes a *power*, destined with advancing time to rule central and southern Europe with iron, but not wholly with tyranny, sway. In the northern temperate zone is the belt of empire. It is early in this transition that the hard, bold, unlovely, but fascinating figure of Frederick appears. The rude force and the unprincipled ambition of the old pagan is in him, guided and systematized by science. That his selfishness has the building of a kingdom for its object gives it something of the aspect of a public virtue. The iron inflexibility with which, from the original mettle of his nature and a half century of fixed habit, he persevered to the last breath of seventy years of life, acquired an air of sublime adherence to duty. Hence his life is a true study to the philosopher, as well as an unfailing excitement to the popular reader. Godless, wicked, and miserable in his intellectual and political greatness, he appeared to himself nothing but a congeries of atoms, organized by blind law into form, and animated by a vital ferment into systematic action, destined to crumble back into the common dust heap. The very strangeness of the whole history binds our attention with its spell; but it warms not the heart and it quickens not the piety. We have been in bad company, have had communion with a bad nature, one of the natures which, in sufficient numbers, would make hell. Mr. Abbott has told the story well. Maps and engravings give reality to it.

Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for the year 1870. 8vo., pp. 521. Nashville, Tenn: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1871.

We rejoice in the aspects of prosperity presented by the Church South. There is a large body of people in the South whose views of our national history, national government, and even national mor-

als, differ from our own, but whose personal character is, we believe, Christian and Methodistic. They, as well as the rest of us, need religion, and the Church and ministry they have must meet their peculiarities. To the prejudices of this class the Church South has, by necessity, consented to adjust itself. We rejoice, as we ever have rejoiced, in her spiritual prosperity, nor has our Quarterly ever sent forth a syllable inconsistent with such a statement. We wish her success in all her departments of Christian activity; in her conversion of souls, in her missions, reformatories, and benevolences; in her literary institutions, her religious periodicals and publications; in her leadership, scholarship, authorship, and episcopate; and in her moralizing and elevating influences over her section, our country, and the world. May she be tenfold more great, prosperous, wide-spread, enlightened, and holy than she is!

There are nine Bishops, Paine, Pierce, Early, Kavanaugh, Wightman, Marvin, Doggett, M'Tyeire, and Keener. With these their Church seems so well pleased as lately to have conferred upon them an important *veto power*. The number of itinerant preachers is near three thousand; of the membership more than half a million, of which thirteen thousand are colored. Collections for missions less than a hundred thousand dollars; an amount which returning secular property will doubtless rapidly increase.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

War Powers under the Constitution of the United States, Military Arrests, Reconstruction, and Military Government. Also, now first published, *War Claims of Aliens.* With Notes on the acts of the Executive and Legislative Departments during our Civil War, and a Collection of Cases decided in the National Courts. By WILLIAM WHITING. Forty-third edition. 8vo. pp. 691. Boston: Lee & Shepard; New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1871.

A learned yet lucid and even popular treatise on the various law and constitutional questions arising before our government and people during the late civil war. The war powers of the administration, the belligerent power of emancipating slaves, the nature and penalties of treason, military arrests, the return of rebellious States to the Union, and military government of hostile territory in time of war, are the momentous topics elucidated with a clearness which renders the book a standard even for the non-professional reader.

The Federal Government; Its Officers and their Duties. By RANSOM H. GILLET. 8vo., pp. 444. New York and Chicago: Woolworth, Ainsworth, & Co. 1871.

This work commences with a brief history of our progress through the colonial and old confederate systems to the formation

of our present national constitution. It then analyzes our constitution. And here it furnishes, what is peculiar to this volume, an abundance of information as to the nature and workings of the various departments. This, having been a juridical official in the Treasury Department, the author is well qualified to do. The book closes with a copy of the United States Constitution. In a country where every man votes for his rulers, volumes like this are of the highest earthly importance. Mr. Gillett's work possesses special excellences of its own.

♦♦♦

Educational.

Four Years in Yale. By a Graduate of '69. 12mo. New Haven, Conn: Charles C. Chatfield & Co. 1871.

A very truthful and piquant picture of college life, and especially, we presume, of Yale life; interesting for those to whom it has never been real life, and peculiarly interesting for those in whose brain it awakens reminiscences of a former state of existence. Our rampant democratic (we do not mean the technical "democracy" of parties) is on the alert to invade with innovations the whole round of the college system. Some good things it may do, and evil things in abundance. It may pour in excitements adverse to study; muscular training that leaves the brain untrained; rich endowments that increase the expenses of the college course, and drive the penniless applicant off the grounds. These are the results into which the great colleges seem to be running; and the little ones are tugging hard after them. A college where pure learning is the real object, and religious influences the substitute for government; where the poor candidate shall not be pilaged with incidental expenses; where, while the body is healthfully exercised, the mind and soul are held the better part of man, we fear is becoming a *desideratum*.

Behind the Bars. 12mo., pp. 356. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.

The "bars" so enigmatically designated are the *claustra* of the Insane Asylum, behind which, according to the writer, misfortune is more terribly punished than crime. The work is written in a style of singular grace and power, displaying, apparently, a great mastery of the painful subject. Its disclosures are discouraging to those who had fancied that our treatment of the insane was one of the most advanced humanities of the age. The work is recommended by its anonymous editor as unequaled in its value upon this most important field for philanthropy.

Miscellaneous.

- A King's Daughter.* With Other Stories from Real Life. By Mrs. H. C. GARDNER. 16mo., pp. 379. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.
- Lindsay Lee.* 16mo., pp. 138. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.
- The Heroine of the White Nile; or, What a Woman Did and Dared.* A Sketch of the Remarkable Travels and Experiences of Miss Alexandrine Tinné. By Professor WILLIAM WELLS. Two Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 207. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.
- Gustavus Adolphus, the Hero of the Reformation.* From the French of L. Abelous. By Mrs. C. A. LACROIX. Five Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 193. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871.
- Agatha's Husband,* a Novel. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "Olive," "The Ogilvies," "The Head of the Family," "A Brave Lady," "The Woman's Kingdom," "Hannah." 12mo., pp. 168. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- Manual of Reading.* In Four Parts. Orthophony, Class Methods, Gesturé and Elocution. Designed for Teachers and Students. By H. L. D. POTTER. 12mo., pp. 420. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- A Terrible Temptation.* By CHARLES READE. 12mo., pp. 250. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham.* Written by Himself. In three vols. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- A Manual of German Conversation,* to succeed the German Course. By GEORGE F. COMFORT, A. M. 12mo., pp. 250. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- The Cousin from India.* A Book for Girls. By GEORGINA M. CRAIK. 12mo., pp. 230. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- King Arthur,* a Poem. By EDWARD BULWER LORD LYTTON. Revised Edition. 12mo., pp. 376. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson.* Compiled from Family Letters and Reminiscences. By his Great-granddaughter, SARAH N. RANDOLPH. 12mo., pp. 432. Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- The Student's Elements of Geology.* By Sir CHARLES LYELL, Bart., F.R.S. 600 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 640. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1871.
- The Young Deliverers of Pleasant Cove.* Pleasant Cove Series. By ELIJAH KELLOGG. 16mo., pp. 304. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.
- The Sword and Garment.* By Rev. L. T. TOWNSEND, Professor in Boston Theological Seminary. 16mo., pp. 238. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard, & Dillingham. 1871.
- School Houses.* By JAMES JOHNNOT. Architectural Designs by S. E. Hewes. 8vo., pp. 114. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. 1871.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—We have published in our present number an article on Church Property, written at our request, and, we believe, with candor and intentional truth. If this be questioned, we are ready to publish any able and candid counter-statement which is furnished by any one leading writer of the Church South early enough for our January or April number, in view of the next session of our General Conference.

INDEX.

- Abbott, John S. C.: History of Frederick the Second, called Frederick the Great... P. 697
 — History of Louis XIV. 355
 Abbott, Jacob: Science for the Young—Heat 581
 Adams: Memoir of Washington Irving, etc. 177
 Agatha's Husband. 700
 Alford: The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. 387
 American Cardinal, The. 532
 American Philological Association, Proceedings of Second Annual Session of. 356
 American Presbyterian Review. 183, 301, 654
 Anderson, Rufus: A Heathen Nation Evangelized. 156
 Anderson, Wm: Treatise on Regeneration. 508
 Annual of Scientific Discovery. 522
 Annual Reports of the Sunday-School Union of the M. E. Church, 1845 to 1871. 399
 Arts of Intoxication (review of Dr. Crane's work) 414
 Temperance literature—its elements of power. 414
 Physiological and psychological effects of various intoxicants. 416
 Tobacco—its history, use, effects. 416
 Alcoholic poison. 418
 Alcohol an anæsthetic. 422
 Atlas designed to Accompany New Handbook of Bible Geography. 352
 Baldwin: The Model Prayer. 532
 Bangs: History of the M. E. Church. 399
 Baptist Quarterly. 296, 654
 Barnard: The Tone Masters. 350
 Barnes: Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Romans. 531
 — Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Gospels. 336
 Bayne: Life and Times of Hugh Miller. 529
 Beale: Protoplasm; or, Life, Matter, and Mind. 159
 Becquerel: La Lumière, Les Causes et ses Effets. 98
 Beecher: The Heavenly State and Future Punishment. 340
 Behind the Bars. 699
 Belcher: Mutineers of the Ship Bounty and their Descendants, etc. 356
 Blart: Adventures of a Young Naturalist. 179
 Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review. 144
 296, 469
 Bibliotheca Sacra. 184, 296, 469
 Bickersteth: The Two Brothers, and other Poems. 532
 Bonar: Life of Rev. John Milne, of Perth. 178
 Boole: Wonders of Grace. 336
 British and Foreign Evangelical Review. 480, 655
 British Quarterly Review. 304, 459, 655
 Broadus: Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. 178
 Brodhead: History of the State of New York. 529
 Büchner: Force and Matter. 516
 Burgen: Letters from Rome. 558
 Burr: Ad Fidem; or, Palish Evidences of the Bible. 531
 Cartwright: Fifty Years Presiding Elder. P. 523
 Catholic Tracts on Various Subjects, Fifty. 505
 Christian Evidences from the Catacombs. 553
 Inscribed slabs. 560
 Origin and description of the Catacombs. 561
 Publications on the Catacombs. 565
 Religious teachings, inscriptions, etc. 567
 Altars, chairs, and paintings. 570
 Symbols. 572
 Christian Quarterly. 133, 296, 479, 654
 Church Extension Society of the M. E. Church, Fifth Annual Report. 329
 Church Property Questions in the South. 614
 Property cases arranged in four classes. 615
 The military cases. 616
 Colored cases. 618
 Holston Conference cases. 620
 Reasons why our people did not surrender all Church property demanded. 627
 Virginia cases. 636
 Intimately connected with the spirit of the Rebellion. 639
 Clark, Bishop: Importance of Doctrinal Truth in Religion, and Man's Responsibility for his belief. 356
 Clark: Work-day Christianity. 123
 Clarke: Orthodox Congregationalism and the Sects. 508
 Clarke: Ten Great Religions. 495
 Comfort: A Manual of German Conversation. 700
 — German Reader to Succeed the German Course. 356
 Consecrated Talents; or, Life of Mrs M. W. Mason. 529
 Constable: Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. 690
 Cope: Hypothesis of Evolution, On the. 162
 Cowles: Ezekiel and Daniel, with Notes. 280
 Craik: The Cousin from India. 700
 Crane: Arts of Intoxication. 354, 414
 Crosby: Jesus—His Life and Work, etc. 333
 Curtius's History of Greece. 533
 Visit to Athens—important excavations. 534
 Credit of discovering Greece due to Phœnicians. 537
 Legislation of Lycurgus and of Solon. 540
 Importance of western part of Greek world. 544
 Priestly office—Influence, power, etc. 545
 Mode of writing. 546
 Age of Pericles. 551
 Dangerous Guest, A. 179
 Darwin: The Descent of Man, etc. 348
 Desk and Debt. 532
 De Stolz: The House on Wheels. 536
 Dexter: Congregationalism, etc. 507
 Diary of the Besieged Resident in Paris. 532
 Dickens: The Mystery of Edwin Drood. 179
 Die moderne Theologie in den Niederlanden, nach der Hauptwerken ihrer berühmtesten Vertreter. 250
 Dindorf: Sophocles ex novissima recensione 531
 Di Ross: Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ Septimo Saeculo Antiquioris. 558
 — Roma Sotterranea. 558

- Discipline of the M. E. Church, 1848 to 1868.....P. 399
- Dodds: Thomas Chalmers..... 177
- Du Chaillu: My Aping! Kingdom..... 179
- Dunn: The Mission of the Spirit..... 688
- Edinburgh Review..... 308, 655
- Emory, John: A Defense of "Our Fathers," and of the Original Organization of the M. E. Church, against the Rev. Alexander McCalne and others..... 679
- Emory, Robert: Hist. of the Discipline of the M. E. Church, 1773 to 1844 inclusive..... 399
- Ephesus, Topography of..... 279
- The plain..... 280
- Its boundaries..... 281
- Ayasalouk..... 283
- Mount Prion—Excavations, etc..... 284
- Situation of the Temple of Diana..... 291
- Episcopal Visitation, Plan of..... 180
- Ethel Linton..... 856
- Evangelical Quarterly Review..... 138, 296, 460
- Every Day..... 356
- Examined, The..... 188
- Ezekiel's Vision..... 260
- Date of the vision..... 260
- The place..... 262
- The prophetic call..... 263
- First appearance of the opening vision..... 264
- The living creatures..... 266
- The wheels..... 272
- The theophany..... 274
- Fairbairn: Ezekiel and Book of his Prophecy..... 260
- Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 131, 324, 490, 669
- France..... 132
- Germany..... 131, 490, 669
- Holland..... 671
- Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 128, 318, 486, 666
- Eastern Churches..... 318
- Roman Catholic Church..... 128
- Roman Catholicism..... 320, 486, 666
- Four Years in Yale..... 699
- Freedman's Aid Society of the M. E. Church..... 329
- Fresh Leaves from the Book and its Story..... 532
- Gardiner: A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English, according to the Authorized Version..... 690
- Gardner: A King's Daughter, etc..... 700
- Geer: The Conversion of St. Paul..... 531
- General Conference of 1844..... 234
- References to articles of Dr. Peck and Dr. Whedon..... 235
- Delegates from Free States divided on slavery..... 237
- Case of Bishop Andrew and Rev. F. A. Harding..... 238
- The Wesleyan Church organized..... 240
- Antislavery convention in Boston, etc..... 240
- Resolutions and action in Bishop Andrew's case..... 243
- Declaration of the Southern delegates..... 247
- George: Annihilationism not of the Bible..... 340
- Gilbert: The Proverbs of Solomon..... 177
- Gillett: Life and Times of John Huss..... 354
- Gillett, R. H.: The Federal Government..... 698
- Goodsir: Seven Homilies on Ethic Inspir'n..... 496
- Graham: Standard Photographic Writer..... 356
- Gray: Bible Lore..... 356
- Gutrie: Saving Knowledge..... 178
- Gwendoline's Harvest..... 179
- Halsey, Rev. L. W. G., D.D.: Memoir of the Life and Character of..... 532
- Hanna: The Life of Christ..... 178
- Harper's New Monthly Magazine, Index to..... 171
- Hart: First Lessons in Composition..... 355
- Havernick: Commentar über den Propheten Ezechiel..... 260
- Head of the Family, the.....P. 532
- Heir Expectant, the..... 179
- Hengstenberg: The Prophecies of the Prophet Ezekiel elucidated..... 260
- Hibbard: Works of Rev. L. L. Hamline, D.D. 532
- Hofmann: Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhangend untersucht..... 511
- Holcombe: The Other Life..... 326
- Holme: Light at Evening Time..... 179
- Holmes: Mechanism in Thought and Morals..... 344
- Home and Health: Monthly Magazine..... 530
- Hudson: Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament..... 363
- Hughes: The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ..... 107
- Hunt, E. M.: Bible Notes for Daily Readers..... 178
- Hunt, John: Religious Thought in England..... 157
- Infant Church Membership, the Logic of... 48
- A divine principle in every age..... 48
- Three forms of social life of divine app't..... 52
- Baptism..... 53
- Theory of congenital regeneration refuted..... 54
- Inglis: One with Christ in Glory..... 531
- Janes: Wesley his own Historian..... 353
- Johannot: School Houses..... 700
- Journals of Gen. Conf. of the M. E. Church, 1796 to 1868..... 399
- Judged by his Works..... 356
- Kellogg: Young Deliverers of Pleasant Cove..... 700
- Kidder: The Christian Pastorate in its Character, Responsibilities, and Duties..... 690
- King Arthur, a Poem..... 700
- Kip: The Catacombs of Rome..... 538
- Kirchhoff: Untersuchungen über das Sonnenspectrum und die Spectren der chemischen Elemente..... 98
- Knottbull-Hugessen: Puss-cat Mew, and other Stories, for my Children..... 179
- Knox: The Infant Sunday-School..... 355
- Lacroix: Gustavus Adolphus, the Hero of the Reformation..... 700
- Translated by, The Problem of Evil..... 504
- Lange: Commentary on the Holy Scriptures..... 507
- Lees: The Temperance Bible Commentary..... 339
- Lelievre: John Wesley: his Life and Work..... 532
- Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham..... 528, 700
- Life of Trust, The (Review of George Müller's book)..... 427
- Mr. Müller's education, conversion, etc..... 428
- His ministerial life..... 428
- Establishes a missionary society, also a home for orphans..... 429
- Bible, tract, and missionary work..... 437
- Lindsay Lee..... 700
- Lockyer: The Wonders of the Heavens..... 531
- London Quarterly Review..... 304, 480, 655
- London Quarterly Review (N. Y. reprint)..... 151, 304, 480, 655
- Long: Art, its Laws and the Reasons for them: Collected, Considered, and Arranged for General and Educational Purposes..... 691
- Lowell: My Study Windows..... 530
- Lyell: The Student's Elements of Geology..... 700
- McCauley: Christian Epitaphs of the First Six Centuries..... 558
- McCauley: Adam and the Adamite..... 153
- McClintock, Dr., Living Words; or, Unwritten Sermons of the late..... 339
- McCosh: Christianity and Positivism..... 563
- Macduff: Memories of Patmos..... 532
- Mac Farlane: The Catacombs of Rome..... 558
- Macley: Alphabetic Dictionary of the Chinese Language in the Foochow Dialect..... 169
- Maitland: The Church in the Catacombs..... 558

Marriott: Testimony of the Catacombs...	535	Price: Visions of the Vale.....	P. 506
Martin: The Atonement.....	508	Problem of Babel, the.....	79
Maudsley: Body and Mind.....	341	Analysis of words.....	82
Mediation, the Function of Thought.....	689	Classification of words.....	85
Mercesburg Review.....	294, 469, 654	Humboldt's three morphological classes of words.....	86
Methodism in the State of New York, etc.....	164	Changefulness of languages.....	89
Methodism in the West, Early.....	579	Consciousness the seat of language.....	94
Western Conference, Oct., 1800—Circuits.....	579	Confusion of tongues, a miraculous touch upon the consciousness of men.....	96
Modes of life of early settlers.....	580	Public Ledger Almanac.....	531
Quarterly meetings.....	583		
Deprivations of pioneer preachers.....	586	Quarterly Book Table.....	153, 326, 495, 672
Miller: Points of Controversy.....	581	Quarterly Review (Gettysburgh).....	654
Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, for 1870.....	697		
Mivart: The Genesis of Species.....	513	Randolph: Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson.....	700
Mohammedanism in Western Africa.....	62	Randolph: Sober Thoughts on Staple Themes.....	531
Beneficial effects of.....	63	Rapid Writer, The.....	386
The Mussulman teacher, the Koran.....	65	Rawson: The Bible Hand-Book.....	179
Arabic manuscripts in Africa.....	69	Reade: A Terrible Temptation.....	700
Mandingoes, the.....	75	Revue Chretienne, Nos. IX—XIII.....	485
Molloy: Geology and Revelation.....	549	Rhemish New Testament.....	107
Monnson: The History of Rome.....	178	The Vulgate.....	107
Monumental Theology.....	5	Papal errors taught in the Rhemish New Testament.....	118
Intellectual strife and its consequences.....	8	Robinson: Stern Necessity.....	179
Monumental theology defined and classified	8	— True to Herself.....	179
Art the expression of a people's spiritual life.....	9	Roma Subterranea.....	558
Characteristics of early Christian art.....	13	Roscoe: Spectrum Analysis.....	98
Catacombs, extent, etc.....	21	Rule: History of the Inquisition in every Country where its Tribunals have been Established.....	179
Motherless; or, A Parisian Family.....	582	Rule: The Holy Sabbath Instituted in Paradise, and Perfected through Christ.....	531
Mudge: Witch Hill.....	177	Russell, Estelle.....	179
Muhlenberg: The Woman and her Accusers.....	532	Russell: Wonders of Bodily Strength and Skill.....	179
Muller: Chips from a German Workshop.....	580		
Munsell: Psychology.....	520	Sands: Reports on the Total Solar Eclipsa of August 7, 1869.....	98
Murray: Outline of Sir Wm. Hamilton's Philosophy.....	172	Schellen: Die Spectralanalyse in ihrer Anwendung auf die Stoffe der Erde, und die Natur der Himmelskörper.....	98
Naegelsbach: The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah.....	507	Schuler: Letters Every-where.....	356
Nash: Perseverance and Apostasy.....	506	Scientific Journals.....	98
Naville, Ernest: His Works and Opinions.....	357	Scott: School History of the United States.....	178
Birth, education, etc.....	358	Secley: Roman Imperialism, and other Essays.....	354
His call to, and expulsion from, Faculty of Letters of Geneva.....	358	Shaip: Culture and Religion in some of their Relations.....	501
His philosophical position.....	360	Shakspeare's Comedy of the Merchant of Venice.....	531
M. Naville an active power in society.....	365	Sibree: The Dying Saviour and the Gypsy Girl.....	179
His interest in the Evangelical Alliance.....	367	Simple Stories with Odd Pictures.....	355
His politics and personal character.....	367	Slavic Races, The.....	25
New Englander.....	469, 654	Causes, obscurity, and contradictions in the historians of.....	25
New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal.....	145, 296	Ethnography of the.....	28
New England Historic Genealogical Society.....	356	Nomenclature of the.....	32
Nippold: Welche Wege fuhren nach Rome? (Which Ways lead to Rome?).....	509	General character of.....	37
North American Review.....	141, 297, 469	Language of.....	38
North British Review.....	146, 304	Present Slavic nations.....	40
Northcote & Brownlow: Roma Subterranea.....	558	Bulgarians.....	41
		Sovates.....	641
Ogilvie, the.....	532	His parentage, education, marriage.....	642
Olive.....	532	His military service.....	643
Olmsted: Walks and Words of Jesus.....	383	His manner of dealing with Sophists.....	645
Opportunities: Sequel to "What She Could".....	532	His particular doctrines.....	647
Owen: Footfalls on the Boundaries of Another World.....	346	Arrested, appears in his own defense.....	649
		His death.....	652
Parker: Ad Clemno, Advice to a Young Preacher.....	340	South America as a Field of Missionary Labor.....	368
Perret: Les Catacombes de Rome.....	558	Facts which render it a promising field.....	368
Perrine: Genl Landscape View of Palestine.....	172	Different modes of reaching the people.....	371
Plumer: Com. on Paul's Epistle to Romans.....	157	Safety of life.....	378
Porter: Books and Reading.....	335	Climate, houses, etc.....	380
Potter: Manual of Reading.....	700	Southern Review.....	297, 470
Pressensé, Edmund de.....	181		
Birth, ancestry, and education.....	181		
Vinet's influence on Pressensé.....	183		
Installed pastor of the Chapelle Taitbout, at Paris.....	185		
His published works.....	186		
Peculiar theory and views.....	199		
His view of baptism.....	202		

Spectrum Analysis.....	P. 98, 204	Universalism during the Past Century:	
Continuous spectra.....	99	Mr. Murray disowned by his children..	P. 467
Spectroscope, description of the.....	P. 99	Universalist Quarterly.....	183, 297, 354
Method of comparing spectra.....	103	Urbino: The Old Masters.....	356
Its application to the heavenly bodies.....	104	Van Dyke: The Lord's Prayer.....	581
Physical constitution of the sun—solar spots and protuberances.....	204	Van Oosterzee: The Theology of the New Testament.....	177
Spectra of the planets and moon.....	208	Veronica.....	179
Spectra of the fixed stars.....	209	Vicarious Atonement.....	589
Nebulae.....	212	History of Jesus unique—his sorrows.....	590
Determination of the motions of the heavenly bodies.....	214	Cause and character of his sufferings.....	591
New chemical elements discovered.....	215	Different views on the atonement.....	592
Spillans, translated by: History of Rome, Livius.....	581	Objections offered to the acceptance of the doctrine of substitutional satisfaction to the justice of God.....	598
Stacey: The Service of Song.....	508	Expiation the fundamental thought of all religious sacrifice.....	607
Steele: A Story of the Rocks.....	350, 356	Victory of the Vanquished, The.....	179
Stevens: History of the M. E. Church in the United States of America.....	399	Vincent: Pictorial Bible Geography for Little Students.....	352
— Hist. of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism.....	399	— Year with Moses, A.....	356
Stevenson: Life and Deeds worth knowing about.....	178	Wakefield: Complete System of Christian Theology, A.....	158
Stockbridge: The Model Pastor, Memoir of Rev. B. Stow.....	531	Webster: History of the M. E. Church in Canada.....	173
Studien und Kritiken.....	315, 482	Wedgwood: John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction of the Eighteenth Century.....	167
Sumner: True Unity of Christ's Church.....	355	Wells: American Religion.....	499
Sunday-School Idea in the M. E. Church, Growth of the.....	399	Wells: The Heroine of the White Nile, etc.....	700
Period of Recognition.....	400	Wesley and Methodism (translated from the Revue des Deux Mondes).....	217, 384
— Organization.....	402	Methodism in Paris.....	217
— Development.....	404	English Reformation promulgated by Wickliffe.....	218
— Incorporation.....	406	Revolution of 1688.....	221
— Expansion.....	408	Wesley's early life, education, piety, etc.....	224
Statistics of our Sunday-schools.....	411	His intercourse with the Moravians.....	226
Sutton: Teachers' Meetings.....	356	Churches closed against him.....	229
Suzanne de L'Orme.....	532	First Methodist chapel built.....	230
Taylor, H. W.: The Times of Daniel.....	508	Separation of Wesley and Whitefield.....	232
Taylor: Marguerite; the Huguenot Child.....	178	The first conference—persecution, etc.....	284
Tennyson, Alfred, Poetical Works of.....	355	Reconciliation between Wesley and Whitefield.....	287
Theological Medium, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.....	470	Coke invested with Episcopal authority.....	392
Theology of Holland, The Modern.....	250	Old age and death of Wesley.....	392
Three departments, of history, philosophy, and dogmatics.....	251	Statistics of his work.....	395
Philosophical element—works of Professor Opzoomer.....	254	Wesley, John, in company with High Churchmen.....	155
Pierson, the acknowledged representative of the doctrinal department.....	256	Westminster Review.....	146, 311, 481, 659
Effect on the people at large.....	258	Whedon: Commentary on the New Testament.....	685
Thompson: Theology of Christ, The.....	158	White: Words and their Uses, etc.....	178
Todd: The Apple Cultivist.....	356	Whiting: War Powers under the Constitution of the United States, Military Arrests, Reconstruction, and Military Government.....	698
Townsend: The Sword and Garment.....	700	Whitney: Hand-Book of Bible Geography.....	352
Trollope: Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite.....	356	Wilberforce: Heroes of Hebrew History.....	173
Trumbull: The Knightly Soldier.....	581	Williams: God's Rescues.....	532
Tyerman: Life and Times of John Wesley.....	350, 692	Willson's Intermediate Fifth Reader.....	178
Underwood: Hand-Book of English Literature.....	532	Windfalls.....	532
Universalism during the Past Century:		Wiseman: Fabiola; or, The Church of the Catacombs.....	558
Doctrinal phases of.....	444	Wolsey: The Religion of the Present and of the Future—Sermons.....	509
Period first—incipient stage—from landing of Rev. J. Murray, 1770, till close of ministry, 1809.....	444	Young: The Christ of History.....	333
Rev. E. Winchester.....	447	— The Creator and the Creation.....	333
Murray versus Winchester.....	448	— The Life and Light of Men.....	333
Period second—Unitarian transformation—from close of Mr. M.'s labors, 1809 to 1845, under Rev. H. Ballou.....	452	Zeitschrift fur die Historische Theologie.....	152
Universalism of Murray revolutionized by Unitarianism.....	454	— 316, 484, 666.....	
Other radical changes.....	456	Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie.....	151
Attempts to produce a schism in Universalist body.....	458	— 317, 483.....	
Period third—from 1845 to the present time.....	461	Zschokke: Labor Stands on Golden Feet.....	178
Early tendencies in this period.....	462		
Future condition of the wicked.....	463		
The periods compared.....	466		

